THE BIBLE
and
UNIVERSAL PEACE
by
GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

EX LIBRIS
SYDNEY & MARGRETTE SNOW

THE BIBLE AND UNIVERSAL PEACE

THE BIBLE AND UNIVERSAL PEACE

By

GEORGE HOLLEY GILBERT

Ph.D., Leipzig University
D.D., Dartmouth College

Author of "The Student's Life of Jesus" (1900), "Jesus" (1912), Interpretation of the Bible (1908), "The Life of Paul" (1899), "A Short History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age" (1906), "The Book of Acts" (1908), etc.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON
1914

COPYRIGHT, 1914, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
[Printed in the United States of America]
Published, October, 1914

To

The hastening of the Glad Age that soon or late

Will surely come

When "man to man, the world o'er,

Shall brothers be for a' that".

CONTENTS

PAGE

Chapter I

War as a Fact in Biblical History .. 1

Chapter II

The Bible on War 35

Chapter III

Peace in the Biblical Visions of a Golden Age 67

Chapter IV

The Influence of the Bible on the Sentiment and the Institutions of Peace: 1. From the Second Century to the Beginning of the Modern Age 91

Chapter V

The Influence of the Bible on the Sentiment and the Institutions of Peace: 2. In the Modern Age .. 134

PAGE

Chapter VI

Modern Appeals to the Bible in Support of War 154

Chapter VII

The Bible, the Church, and Universal Peace 195

Chapter VIII

Jesus and the Modern Peace Movement 207

PREFACE

No book has ever done so much for peace or for war as the Bible. No book is now so dangerous to peace as is the Bible when read by devout ignorance and pious selfishness, in the stress of some real or imagined national peril. And no book has resources available for the abolition of war that are at all comparable to the resources of the Bible.

It is the aim of the following pages to set in as clear a light as possible the relation between the Bible and the hope of universal peace. This is done, primarily, not in the interest of peace, tho that is dear, but in the interest of truth. Even war is not so hateful nor so permanently injurious to the race as the misuse of the Bible in support of war. To poison the fountain is to poison the stream that issues from it, and the perversion of the Bible by false interpretation is akin to the poisoning of a fountain, in this case one of the important fountains of civilization.

In pursuance of the aim of the book, we first

give a survey of the wars of the Bible. Investigation of this subject is clearly fundamental to a correct understanding of the views of war exprest in the Bible. Having considered the fact of war in Biblical history, we next consider how Biblical writers regarded this fact, first the ancient Hebrew views of war, and afterward the Christian teaching which rendered the old views obsolete. This is succeeded by a study of the element of peace in those outlooks on the future which form so fascinating a part of the sacred writings. To trace the influence of the Bible on the sentiment and the institutions of peace from the beginning of Christian literature in the second century down to the Hague Conference of 1907 is the task to which the next two chapters are devoted. The modern appeal to the Bible in support of war is then illustrated in connection with our Civil War and the British Boer War of 1899. The duty and the opportunity of the Church in making the Bible contribute to the movement for universal peace are then discust, and, finally, the relation of Jesus to the Modern Peace Movement.

There are many people who care for peace but who do not care for the Bible, and there are many who care for the Bible but are not particularly interested in peace. It would seem that the former

class, in the best interests of peace, ought to find in the Bible a staunch and strong ally, and that the latter class, in the interest of the Bible, ought to learn that, at its highest, it is the great book of peace.

THE BIBLE AND UNIVERSAL PEACE

Chapter I.

WAR AS A FACT IN BIBLICAL HISTORY

IT is significant that the earliest writing which is quoted by name in the Old Testament is the book of the *Wars of Yahweh*.[1] With much propriety might the epic title of this lost writing be given to extensive sections of the sacred literature of the Hebrews. It is doubtful whether Ares and Mars are more prominent in classical history, or Thor in that of Scandinavia, than is a warlike Yahweh in the Old Testament. It is the aim of this chapter to follow the red current of war through Hebrew history, to the end that we may have before us the true background for the Bible's utterances concerning war and peace.

What had been the fortunes of the Hebrew tribes before the struggle for independence in the age of Moses, it is not possible to say. Stories

[1] Num. 21:14.

of the patriarchal age, which may have appeared in written form in the ninth and eighth centuries B.C., doubtless preserve ancient traditions which had some foundation in actual life, but the historical element in these stories is dim and uncertain. That the father of the Hebrew people, the pioneer of faith from Ur of the Chaldees, had 318 trained soldiers in his household,[2] that he was a captain, both courageous and skilful, ready to hazard his life for the sake of his kinsman Lot, and able to pluck their spoil from the four kings who had waged a successful war against the peoples of the lower Jordan valley; that the first priest of God mentioned in Scripture—Melchizedek of Salem—celebrated Abraham's victory with a sort of *Te Deum*, less elaborate no doubt, but not less sincere than the *Te Deums* with which the Bulgarians have in this present year[3] celebrated their victory over the Turks—all this may have no further historical value than to show us the conceptions of a time long subsequent to that of Abraham. In like manner may we judge of the angel's prediction in regard to Ishmael,[4] that his hand should be against every man and every man's hand against him. This may be little more than an easy justification of the long-standing hostility between

[2] Gen. 14:14. [3] 1913. [4] Gen. 16:12.

Israel and the Ishmaelites. Isaac's blessing of Esau[5] and Jacob's blessing of his sons,[6] whether handed down by word of mouth through many generations or produced in the early times of the Hebrew monarchy, are very suggestive in regard to early national ideals. Isaac blest Esau in these words:

> By thy sword shalt thou live, and thou shalt serve thy brother,
> And it shall come to pass, when thou shalt break loose,
> That thou shalt shake his yoke from off thy neck.

Life by the *sword* is hardly thinkable as a paternal *blessing,* except among a people whose sons drank in a warlike spirit with their mothers' milk. Throughout Jacob's blessing of his children there is a breath as from the camp and the battlefield. The swords of Simeon and Levi, we read, are weapons of violence; Judah is a lion's whelp, and his hand is to be upon the neck of his enemies; Benjamin is a ravening wolf; Gad is to press upon the heel of him who dares to assault him, and the bow of Joseph is to abide in strength.

Thus, out of the twilight of the patriarchs, the echoes that are borne down to us on the pages of Genesis are predominantly warlike. But that was the way of men elsewhere in those ages, in Egypt and Assyria, and among the earliest ancestors of

[5] Gen. 27:40. [6] Gen. 49:5, 8, 27.

the Greeks of whom we have any knowledge. Through the poems of Homer we look back into a gray antiquity, when the inhabitants of Asia Minor, the Ægean Islands, and the coast of Greece were always armed and when their chief business was war.

The traditions regarding the age of Moses and Joshua, which possess at least a historical nucleus, are in no little measure a series of illustrations of the statement that Yahweh, the God of Israel, is a "man of war,"[7] taken with the correlative belief that Israel was the chosen people of Yahweh. The story of the migration from Egypt to the eastern bank of the Jordan, over against Jericho, and the story of the invasion of Palestine, are wholly consistent with the modern view that Yahweh, the God of Israel, was originally the storm-god of Sinai, a resistless warrior who used for his purposes not only the people whom he had chosen, but also, on occasion, the winds and the waters, the hailstones, and the lightning.

Moses, the hero of the Exodus, was hardly, as the Ephraimite source teaches, the *meekest* of men, one who hoped by meekness to accomplish his great ends. His first appearance, when arrived at years of maturity, was in the double rôle of an

[7] Ex. 15:3.

impetuous patriot and a hater of Egyptians.[8] When he saw two Hebrews contending, he sought to make peace between them, but when he saw two men contending together, of whom one was an Egyptian, he smote the Egyptian, apparently without investigating the cause of the struggle, and hid his body in the sand. This act was ominous for those nations whom Moses in future years was destined to meet as he led his people northward.

The first recorded battle that Moses fought was with the Amalekites in Rephidim.[9] Whether Amalek was responsible for this conflict, as the Hebrew narrative represents the case, one can not say, tho the burden of proof would seem to rest upon those who had entered Amalek's territory with a great and hungry host without Amalek's consent. The most striking feature of the story, and that which is of importance for our subject, is that Amalek's attack on Israel, tho repelled with heavy loss to Amalek, was later regarded as a ground for implacable enmity toward this people. The Hebrew leader is represented as having believed that Yahweh would wage war with Amalek from generation to generation until he should have wrought its utter extinction. Thus his conception of Yahweh was obviously deficient in the

[8] Ex. 2:11-13. [9] Ex. 17:8-15.

element of simple justice, or, to state it differently, Yahweh's devotion to his people, with whom he had entered into covenant, was thought to absolve him from any obligation to show mercy or even justice toward the enemies of Israel. His attitude toward such people was supposed to be one of inextinguishable hatred. It is no wonder that the more ethical writer of Deuteronomy endeavored to soften the rigor of this earlier account by representing Amalek's conduct toward Israel as exceedingly base and inhuman. He says that Amalek, in utter disregard of God, hung on the rear of Israel and cut off all stragglers without mercy.[10]

Moses had yet four wars in the course of his journey to Canaan, if we include that with Midian, which is found only in one of the later strata of the Pentateuch. He fought with the Canaanites of Arad[11]—whether a defensive or an offensive war, the narrative does not show—and at first suffered some loss, but his vow to "devote" the enemy to Yahweh secured his mighty help, and Israel was victorious. After this he fought in succession with two Amorite kings or sheiks, Sihon and Og, of whom the former is said to have attacked Israel in reply to a courteous request for the privilege of passing through his territory. Og,

[10] Deut. 25:17-19. [11] Num. 21:1-3.

however, is said to have gone out of his borders to attack Moses,[12] probably regarding him as a dangerous marauder and wishing to have the inevitable conflict at a distance from his own towns and fields. In these campaigns Moses put the enemy to the sword, but spared their cities and took them for his own people—an evidence that Israel was not disposed to bound the promised land too narrowly.[13] Fortified cities surrounded by fertile fields were not to be lightly passed by, but were to be occupied.

The last military exploit of Moses was the merciless campaign against the Midianites, the memory of which seems to have survived through many generations, as the story of Attila survived in Europe. The occasion of this war was quite unlike the occasions of former conflicts in the career of Moses. It was the influence of Midianitish women in turning some of the Israelites to the worship of the Baal of Peor.[14] This apostasy provoked the anger of Yahweh against Israel, and it was only quieted by the sacrifice of the chiefs of the people,[15] and those men who had worshiped Baal-peor, and, moreover, it led Yahweh to com-

[12] Num. 21:33.

[13] See, *e.g.*, Gen. 12:7; 13:12, 14-17; 17:8.

[14] Num. 25:3; 31:16. [15] Num. 25:3-5.

mand a war of vengeance against Midian.[16] This command, which is, of course, utterly foreign to modern ideas of right, is explicable on the basis of polytheism. The Midianites were worshipers of Baal, while Israel belonged to Yahweh. If, then, the women of Midian stole away the hearts of the Israelites they became enemies of Yahweh, and, therefore, he must wish to destroy them.

It is characteristic of ancient warfare in general, as well as of Israel's way in war, that the soldiers who made the campaign against Midian shared in the spoils. The enemy were slain and their cities burned, but all the gold and silver, the sheep and cattle, the virgins and female children, were divided equally between the men of war and the people at home. The soldiers were required to give one-fifth of 1 per cent. of their spoil to Yahweh, and the people 2 per cent. of their half of the spoil to the Levites.[17] Thus it appears that the individual soldier reaped a considerable harvest from this particular campaign—about twenty-eight sheep, three oxen, two and a half asses, one and a third virgins, besides a handsome booty in jewels and gold.

The major part of the tribes that had fought their way to the Jordan under the leadership of

[16] Num. 25:17-18. [17] Num. 31:28, 30.

Moses continued their victorious invasion under his successor. Thirty-one kings are said to have been smitten in Joshua's day on the west of the Jordan.[18] It is no longer reported that Israel acted on the defensive, as had been done in the case of the war with Amalek. The treatment of Jericho is, perhaps, typical of much of the struggle in Joshua's day. Israel came against this city in the Jordan valley with no provocation whatever, unless it be regarded as a provoking circumstance that its inhabitants were living in a region which Israel wished for itself, and which it believed, or which later times believed, belonged to it by divine right as a gift of Yahweh. When Jericho fell, its inhabitants were put to the sword. Later in the invasion some captured cities were burned, others were occupied by Israel.

Thus it was by the sword that the Hebrew people secured a place of permanent habitation. Israel's blessing of Esau, that he should live by the sword, was fulfilled in this chapter of Jacob's history, whether it was in the career of Esau or not. Israel entered Canaan sword in hand, and the sword was seldom laid aside in the subsequent centuries until nations mightier than they arose against them and took away their independence.

[18] Josh. 12:24.

The period of the Judges was one in which Israel, now vainly and now successfully, struggled to maintain itself in the hill-country of Palestine and Gilead against its enemies on all sides. Almost the only deeds handed down by tradition from this long and dark period are deeds of war. Some of these were merely individual exploits, as the deeds of Shamgar and Samson, but there were three conflicts that assumed extensive proportions, namely, those in which Deborah, Gideon, and Jephthah came to the front as leaders.

Deborah, a judge and a prophetess, may be called a military woman, for whether she was present on the field, like Jeanne d'Arc, or not, she directed the battle and inspired Barak with courage. The spirit of that age in warlike matters is unpleasantly manifest in the fact that Jael's treacherous murder of Sisera, the leader of the Canaanites, whom she had invited into her tent, is highly praised in the ancient song of Deborah.[19]

Blessed above women shall Jael be,
The wife of Heber the Kenite;
Blessed shall she be above women in the tent.
He asked water, *and* she gave him milk;
She brought him butter in a lordly dish.
She put her hand to the tent-pin,
And her right hand to the workmen's hammer;

[19] Judges 5:24–27.

And with the hammer she smote Sisera, she smote through
his head;
Yea, she pierced and struck through his temples.
At her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay;
At her feet he bowed, he fell:
Where he bowed, there he fell down dead.

This is barbarism without a touch of noble or heroic sentiment to relieve its blackness. It is not different from the barbarism of ancient times in other lands.

The struggle that made Gideon famous, like that against Jabin, King of Hazor, in which Deborah won her victory, is portrayed as a rebellion against conditions that were intolerable. The Midianites were in the habit of making raids across the Jordan into Palestine, and they carried off the sheep, oxen, and asses, together with all the grain that they could seize.[20] Gideon, aroused by a vision, and having begun his military career with a religious act, in the destruction of the altar of Baal and the Asherah, attacked the army of the invaders by night with only a handful of men, traditionally the same number that won the victory at Thermopylæ, and scattered them in a disastrous defeat.[21] Zebah and Zalmunna, the captured Midianite kings, were killed by Gideon himself in cold blood.[22]

[20] Judges 6:4. [21] Judges 7:8, 22; 8:10-12.
[22] Judges 6:21.

The war against the Ammonites that Jephthah brought to a successful conclusion is also represented as a defensive struggle. Its chief interest for the subject in hand is the light which it throws on the warlike relation of the tribes to each other at that time. Ephraim fought against Jephthah simply because this leader had not summoned him to the war with Ammon. The Gileadite had won prestige by his victory, and that fact was sufficient to stir up the warlike brother-tribe beyond the Jordan. A little later the tribe of Benjamin was greatly reduced by a conflict with other Israelitish clans,[23] and the inhabitants of Jabesh-Gilead were put to the sword by their kinsmen, excepting only four hundred young girls.[24] Thus the period of the Judges was one of war, both foreign and domestic.

The transition from the obscure and stormy age of Samson and Deborah, of Gideon and Jephthah, to the more orderly age of the Hebrew monarchy, was not a change from war to peace, but rather from war to more elaborate and successful war. The *Song of the Bow,* from the book of Jashar, celebrates the first Hebrew king and his son as "weapons of war,"[25] and says in their praise:

[23] Judges 20. [24] Judges 21:8-12. [25] 2 Sam. 1:27.

From the blood of the slain, from the fat of the mighty,
The bow of Jonathan turned not back,
And the sword of Saul returned not empty.[26]

With this vivid picture from the *Song of the Bow,* agrees all that we learn in regard to the beginning of the Hebrew monarchy. Saul gathered around him a standing army of chosen men,[27] and fought against Moab and Ammon, Edom and Zobah, the Philistines and the Amalekites. Only of these last-mentioned campaigns has tradition preserved any details. Of the second war with the Amalekites we are given the interesting information that it was undertaken to wipe out the wrong done to Israel by Amalek some two hundred and fifty years before.[28] It was a campaign of extermination, and when the King of Israel spared Agag, the Amalekite ruler, and brought him home as a captive, the prophet Samuel hewed him in pieces "before Yahweh" in Gilgal; that is, Yahweh was supposed to be a witness of the deed of blood done in his honor.

Saul's campaigns against the Philistines were a part of the hereditary conflict between the people of the mountains and the people of the plain. While these campaigns were attended with a measure of success, they were never decisive, and

[26] 2 Sam. 1:22. [27] 1 Sam. 13:2; 14:52. [28] 1 Sam. 15:33.

at last both Saul and Jonathan fell on the field of Gilboa, before these powerful enemies from the western coast-land.

The magnitude of Saul's battles with the Philistines and Amalekites can not be closely calculated from the sources at hand. If the number of fighting men in Israel in Deborah's time was 40,000,[29] then a popular campaign like that of Saul against Amalek, may have called out an army of 10,000 or 15,000, about as large a force as Washington had at Yorktown.

Saul was indeed a "weapon of war," and as such not unlike most of the kings of his time. War seems to have been the chief occupation of his reign. How often he was the aggressor, and how often he fought in self-defense, the sources do not enable one to say. We see his wars only from the Hebrew side. It may be that he was moved by patriotic motives in behalf of Jabesh-Gilead, and against the Philistines, but the campaign against Amalek, ostensibly for an injury done eight generations before his day, may be taken as indicating that when rich booty was in sight and within probable reach it was not difficult

[29] Judges 5:8. The numbers in 1 Sam. 11:8; 13:5, and 15:4, as in many other passages, notably in Chronicles, are not regarded as even approximately correct.

to secure what was supposed to be divine sanction for war.

If Saul was a "weapon of war," so also was his greater successor. The writer of Chronicles needed no other information than that which we have in the books of Samuel and Kings, to justify his statement that David was a man of war who had shed much blood on the earth.[30] Hushai the Archite was doubtless right in saying to Absalom: "All Israel knoweth that thy father is a mighty man," meaning by that expression a redoubtable fighter.[31] David did not come to the kingdom without much bloodshed, nor continue in it without more. The extraordinary halo that gathered around his head in later centuries, and his relation to the expectation of a Golden Age, render it fitting that we should dwell somewhat fully upon his warlike career.

David began his public life with the exploit against Goliath,[32] which shows him as an expert with the sling, and in consequence of this deed he was made the chief of Saul's men of war.[33] When by his martial achievements he had eclipsed the fame of Saul and had thereby aroused the King's deadly hatred, he left his own

[30] 1 Chron. 22:8; 28:3.
[31] 2 Sam. 17:8.
[32] 2 Sam. 17.
[33] 1 Sam. 18:5.

land and people, and became a subject of Achish, ruler of Gath, one of Israel's hereditary foes.[34] He took with him six hundred men with their families, probably the strongest of his political supporters and the ablest fighters, and while in the land of the Philistines, he seems to have followed the career of a freebooter, which was as popular among the Semites on the east of the Mediterranean as it was among the contemporary Greeks on the northern coast. It appears that he was free to plan his raids and to execute them, only he reported to Achish[35] and doubtless divided the spoils with him. It is especially significant that the narrative represents him as ready to go up with Achish even against his own people Israel.[36] Achish himself was in favor of taking him, but other Philistine leaders, suspecting David's loyalty, opposed and defeated the plan.

After Saul's death, David returned to the land of Judah, and became king of his tribe. Years of war between him and the family of Saul followed,[37] but at last he was anointed king over all the tribes. This event, however, did not usher in an era of peace. Foreign wars continued as before. Again and again he marshaled his

[34] 1 Sam. 27:1-4. [35] 1 Sam. 27:10.
[36] 1 Sam. 29:2. [37] 2 Sam. 3-5.

forces against the Philistines, and with his third victory he carried the war into the enemies' land,[38] but even thus he did not secure permanent peace.[39] He fought also with Moab and the King of Zobah,[40] as Saul had done, and extended his conquests as far as the region of Damascus.[41] Two bloody campaigns were carried on against the Ammonites, in one of which the Syrians joined Ammon against him.[42] In addition to these foreign wars there was the domestic strife brought about by his own son Absalom, which nearly cost him his throne.[43]

Thus the story of David is almost exclusively a tale of war, like that of Achilles or Agamemnon. Fighting was his chief vocation. Our sources do not suggest that he ever sought peace except by the sword or maintained it save by arms. Pacific diplomacy did not enter into his ideal of a kingship for his times, unless we assume that the wives whom he took from Jerusalem[44] were Jebusites—not an improbable supposition—and that these alliances were made in the interest of peace. But even if this were the case, it would not seriously affect the picture

[38] 2 Sam. 5:17-25; 8:1.
[39] 2 Sam. 21:15-22.
[40] 2 Sam. 8:2-3.
[41] 2 Sam. 8:5-6.
[42] 2 Sam. 10-11; 12:26-31.
[43] 2 Sam. 15-19:10.
[44] 2 Sam. 5:13.

of David's warlike character and reign. He was a fighter both by nature and by lifelong training. His "mighty men" were not diplomats or statesmen, but were simply men of great physical strength and skill, of unflinching courage and perfect loyalty, a Shammah who stood alone in a plot of lentils, and defended it against a troop of Philistines; an Abishai who lifted up his spear against three hundred men, and slew them; and a Benaiah who went down into a pit alone in the time of snow and slew a lion. Such were the men whom David chose to be around him, and such a man was he. That he was at all in advance of his age, in his thought of war or his conduct of a campaign, our sources nowhere suggest. The tradition that makes him the author of such a spiritual and quiet contemplation as the twenty-third Psalm, has against it the story of his warlike and bloody career.

The comparatively peaceful reign of Solomon, to which we are now come, may have been due, in part, to the might of his father's sword. But this period of rest from war in Israel was like the lull before a storm, and it soon passed never to return. With Solomon's death the union of Israel, founded on violence and bloodshed, was rent in twain, and fratricidal strife stained the soil

of Palestine during the three following centuries, while foreign wars were waged from time to time, both by the northern and the southern kingdom.

We will glance first at these foreign campaigns. For a long period it seems to have been a regular part of Israel's yearly program to fight the Syrians, as it had been in earlier ages to go down against the Philistines. It was a memorable event when, in the reign of Ahab, there came a three years' cessation of hostilities between Israel and the Syrians.[45] After this happy interval, war with these enemies on the north was resumed, and figured largely in the reigns of six kings of Israel, which together covered more than a century and a quarter.[46] Under Hazael the Israelites east of the Jordan were smitten, and even Jerusalem was forced to buy immunity from siege at a great price, but in the time of Ben-hadad II, the son of Hazael, the tide of war turned, and the Syrians were thrice defeated. There were also wars with Moab and Edom, which these peoples waged to secure political freedom from Israel.[47] Twice in this period

[45] 1 Kings 22:1.

[46] 2 Kings 6:24; 8:25; 10:32; 13:3, 24, 25; 15:31; 16:5; 24:2.

[47] 2 Kings 3:6; 8:20; 14:7.

the Egyptians came into Palestine, once in the days of Rehoboam when they sacked Jerusalem, for what cause we do not know, and again in the reign of Josiah, who, attacking the Egyptians in the plains of Megiddo, was slain, and his kingdom was made tributary to Egypt.[48] Three times the Assyrians came against the northern kingdom, at last taking its capital (721 B.C.), and thoroughly subduing the land,[49] and four times the waves of invasion from the Euphrates valley came up over Judah, once from Assyria, and thrice from Babylon, the last invasion ending with the complete destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. The struggle with the Syrians and yet more obviously the struggle with Assyrians and Babylonians were struggles for continued national existence. Whether Israel could have avoided these conflicts without the sacrifice of his national independence, it is obviously idle to ask.

We turn back now from this brief survey of the foreign wars of Israel and Judah, in the period between the division of the kingdom and the fall of Jerusalem, to an equally brief survey of the wars which they fought with each other,

[48] 1 Kings 14:25-28; 2 Kings 23:29, 33-34.

[49] 2 Kings 15:19, 29; 17:3.

and the more numerous domestic struggles of each kingdom.

The prophet Shemaiah averted civil war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam at the time of the dissolution of the kingdom,[50] but only temporarily, as it appears.[51] The argument was, that the division of the kingdom proceeded from Yahweh, but while this argument may have been effectual as against an attempt to bring the tribes together again under a single head, it did not prevent inter-tribal strife. The forces of the two kingdoms were, indeed, sometimes driven to act together by a great common peril, as when Jehoshaphat and Ahab combined against the Syrians,[52] or when Ahab's son and Jehoram of Judah united against Hazael,[53] but at other times the brother-kingdoms even went to the length of hiring foreigners against one another. Thus Asa, of whom it is said that he did what was right in the eyes of Yahweh,[54] hired Ben-hadad to fight against Israel,[55] and later the Syrians cooperated with Israel against Judah.[56] But whether with foreign aid or not, Israel and Judah were frequently at war. No second

[50] 1 Kings 12:21-24.
[51] 1 Kings 14:3.
[52] 1 Kings 22:2.
[53] 2 Kings 8:25-29.
[54] 1 Kings 15:11.
[55] 1 Kings 15:18.
[56] 2 Kings 15:37; 16:5.

Shemaiah arose with power to hold them back from sanguinary conflict.

Still more constant and deadly was the civil strife that was carried on within each of the brother-kingdoms. Between the revolution of Baasha, who smote King Nadab and wiped out his family,[57] and the fall of Samaria, the throne of Israel was six times violently overturned. It is a bloody tale how Elah with all his house was destroyed by Zimri,[58] how Zimri in turn perished by his own hand, rather than fall into the clutches of Omri,[59] how Joram, with the queen mother, Jezebel, and all his brothers, were slaughtered by Jehu,[60] how King Zechariah was assassinated by the conspirator Shallum,[61] who thus secured the throne, and how he, after one short month of kingship, was murdered by the fierce Menahem,[62] how Menahem's son Pekahiah, who succeeded his father on the throne of Israel, was slain in his palace by Pekah his chief officer,[63] and how Pekah at last found a violent death at the hands of Hoshea.[64]

In the period when these crimes were being perpetrated in Israel, the throne of Judah was

[57] 1 Kings 15:27-29.
[58] 1 Kings 16:8-12.
[59] 1 Kings 16:18.
[60] 2 Kings 9:24, 33; 10:7.
[61] 2 Kings 15:10.
[62] 2 Kings 15:14.
[63] 2 Kings 15:25.
[64] 2 Kings 15:30.

three times vacated through violence. Queen Athaliah, whose grandfather had subverted the throne of Israel, was murdered in the daytime, near the temple, at the command of Jehoiada.[65] Jehoash, Athaliah's grandson, was killed by his servants,[66] and Athaliah's great-grandson, King Amaziah, died at the hands of conspirators.[67]

If, in human history, they who draw the sword are likely to perish at last by the sword, then it was no wonder that Israel and Judah, after centuries of fratricidal bloodshed, went down, sword in hand, amid the tumult of falling walls, the cries and groans of the wounded and the dying.

With the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., we arrive at the end of what the Bible has to say of war as a fact in Hebrew history. The descendants of those Jews who returned from the captivity in Babylon, or of those who were left in the land when Jerusalem was destroyed, fought heroically in the second century B.C. under the leadership of the Maccabees, but that conflict is not a part of our Biblical record. Finally, the writings of the New Testament record no wars, tho two of the most terrible conflicts in all history took place in or near Jerusalem before the conclusion of the New Testament,

[65] 2 Kings 11:15. [66] 2 Kings 12:20. [67] 2 Kings 14:19.

namely, that which ended with the complete destruction of the Holy City in 70 A.D., and that which broke out in the year 132 A.D., under the inspiration of Barcochba.

It remains now to complete this sketch of war as a fact in Biblical history by gathering up the few scattered details in our sources regarding its methods and regarding the treatment of captives.

With the centralization of the government in Saul there came also the standing army, at first of only 3,000 footmen,[68] at last, in Solomon's day, of 12,000 horsemen,[69] and we know not how many unmounted soldiers. That the institution of a standing army was maintained in Judah and Israel in the centuries between Solomon and the fall of Jerusalem may be inferred both from the almost constant state of war which prevailed, and also from the fact that the repeated overturnings of the government, especially in Israel, were usually effected by means of the army; but details of the strength of the standing military force in the two kingdoms at different periods are wanting. Between David's time and the over-

[68] 1 Sam. 13:2.

[69] 1 Kings 10:26. According to the chronicler, David had a trained host of twelve times 24,000 men, but neither these figures nor the scheme of changing the army every month can be regarded as probable.

throw of Damascus in the reign of Ahaz,[70] a period in which the Syrians prest hard on Israel, it seems probable that, when a strong king reigned in Israel, garrisons were kept in some of the strategic border cities, like Elath,[71] as was done by David.[72] Thus Jehu was a captain in the garrison of Ramoth-gilead, when anointed by Elisha's messenger.[73] Such garrisons naturally constituted a standing army.

Of military organizations among the Hebrews from the time of Saul we learn only that, as among the Philistines, so in Israel, there was an officer for a company of fifty, one for a hundred, and also one for a thousand.[74] In the days of the monarchy, and occasionally, at least, in later times, there was a first officer over the entire host,[75] as Abner a "prince and a great man," who was over Saul's army, Joab who was David's general-in-chief, Benaiah who was over the army of Solomon, and Omri who was captain of the host of Israel in the reign of Baasha.

Of military tactics among the Hebrews we hear only of the primitive ambuscade.[76] They

[70] 2 Kings 16:9. [71] 2 Kings 16:6. [72] 2 Sam. 8:6, 14.
[73] 2 Kings 9:5.
[74] 1 Sam. 22:7; 2 Sam. 18:4; 1 Sam. 8:12; 29:2.
[75] 2 Sam. 2:8; 8:16; 1 Kings 4:4; 16:16.
[76] Josh. 8:2.

lacked the military genius of the Macedonians and Romans, tho equal to them in bravery and endurance. At their best, as under Judas Maccabæus, and perhaps, under Moses and Joshua, they found in their religious faith a power that more than made good their lack of tactical skill.

The implements of war among the Hebrews were those which were common to all the civilized nations of antiquity, and which continued to devour human life until, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries of our era, they began to give way to the more destructive firearms.

The primitive and inexpensive sling, which is said to have been a deadly weapon in David's hand, is not mentioned as in use later than the eighth century B.C., and does not appear to have been common in Israel at any time. At all periods of Hebrew history the sword and the bow were the principal means of warfare. The children of Judah were once taught the *Song of the Bow,* from the book of Jashar, and the warlike song that is ascribed to David mentions only the bow as an implement of war, and that a bow of brass.[77] Associated with the sword and bow, and common in the days of Saul, was the spear.

[77] 2 Sam. 22:36.

A century after David's death the spears which his men had carried in their numerous battles were preserved in the temple,[78] as we keep the sword of George Washington and the flint-lock of Ethan Allen.

When the tribes of Israel prest into Canaan from the desert, they found there a people who in war used chariots of iron.[79] King Jabin of Hazor is said to have had 900 of these engines of death.[80] They were in use among the neighboring Philistines and Syrians in the time of the monarchy.[81] As the Israelites at the beginning of their residence in Palestine were not able to stand against these war-chariots, they were forced to find dwelling-places in the mountainous parts of the country, where chariots could not be used to advantage. But when the power of Israel increased under David, he began to use chariots,[82] and Solomon's military equipment is said to have included 1,450.[83] While the exploit of Deborah proved, indeed, that it was possible for footmen to meet war-chariots, as, in the Maccabæan age, the Jews successfully met war-elephants, it was clearly a most dangerous and costly mode of

[78] 2 Kings 11:10. [79] Josh. 17:16. [80] Judges 4:3.
[81] 1 Sam. 13:5; 2 Sam. 10:18.
[82] 2 Sam. 8:4. [83] 1 Kings 10:26.

fighting. Israel's expansion called for chariots as modern warfare calls for cannon, smokeless powder, and battleships. The surrounding nations of the first rank, as the Egyptians and Assyrians, used chariots in war.

The horrors of warfare among the ancient Hebrews, as elsewhere, are nowhere more manifest than in the treatment of captives. As war with sword and spear is necessarily war at close range, it is not strange that the inhumanity of man to man was intensified. The Syrians in the reign of Ben-hadad may have heard that the kings of the house of Israel were merciful,[84] but we should regard this statement somewhat differently had we found it in a *Syrian* document. At any rate, our sources do not justify us in regarding the ancient Hebrew treatment of captives as essentially less barbarous and unmerciful than their treatment by contemporary nations. It was no exaggeration of Israel's spirit and purpose when Balaam said of him:[85]

> He shall eat up the nations, his adversaries,
> And shall break their bones in pieces.

That is to say, in war he is an animal with the ferocity of a tiger, not he *alone* but he *no less*

[84] 1 Kings 20:31. [85] Num. 24:8.

than other men. What Elisha anticipated that Hazael of Damascus would do unto the children of Israel was, doubtless, only what Ben-hadad had sometimes done already, and what the children of Israel on their part had done to the Syrians when by the fortune of war Syrians had fallen into their hands. The prophet said to Hazael: "Their strongholds wilt thou set on fire, and their young men wilt thou slay with the sword, and wilt dash in pieces their little ones, and rip up their women with child."[86] Samuel enjoined upon Saul to slay the Amalekites—both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass—and on his return Saul declared that he had performed the command of Yahweh,[87] only the people had spared the chief of the devoted things, namely, the pick of the sheep and oxen. Accordingly, we are to understand that the women and children, as well as the men, had been destroyed.

When David in the service of Achish made a foray against the Geshurites, he saved neither man nor woman alive, but when the Amalekites raided Ziklag, David's city, they spared all the women and children, and carried them off as

[86] 2 Kings 8:12.
[87] 1 Kings 15:3, 13.

prisoners.[88] We do not infer from this that the Amalekites were more merciful than David. It is probable that they saved the women and children alive for purely economic reasons. Of the Moabite captives whom David took in a certain war two-thirds were put to death, and the prisoners taken in Rabbah and other Ammonite cities were, according to the common reading of the Hebrew text, put under saws and under harrows of iron.[89] This treatment of captives is certainly not incredible in a man who, on the brink of the grave, could instruct his son to shed the blood of his gray-headed and faithful general, and to slay Shimei with the sword whom he had sworn by Yahweh not to kill.[90]

As Samuel rebuked Saul for sparing Agag, so an unnamed prophet rebuked Ahab because he did not utterly destroy Ben-hadad.[91] When the hand of Yahweh came upon Elisha, he declared that Jehoshaphat and Jehoram with the King of Edom should smite every fortified city of the Moabites and every choice city, which implies that the inhabitants were to be put to the sword.[92] When it is related of the same prophet that he

[88] 1 Sam. 27:9; 30:2.
[89] 2 Samuel. 8:2; 12:31.
[90] 1 Kings 2:5, 9.
[91] 1 Kings 20:42.
[92] 2 Kings 3:19.

counseled the king of Israel to treat certain Syrian captives magnanimously, to feed them and send them back to their master, it is obvious that he wished in this way to frighten that master by making him believe that he, Elisha, who had smitten the captives with blindness, and after bringing them into the city of Samaria had restored their sight, was clothed with supernatural power.[93]

The directions of the Deuteronomist touching the treatment of captives do not wholly agree with earlier historical parts of the Pentateuch. Israel did not *utterly* destroy the Hittite and Amorite, the Canaanite and Perizzite, the Hivite and Jebusite, even when it was in its power so to do, nor can we say that in its wars against other peoples, as the Syrians and the Moabites it always offered peace to the inhabitants of a city if they would become tributary, and if they refused, always spared the women and the little ones. Israel did not exterminate the various peoples of Canaan, and did not seek so to do as a settled policy, neither did it have one method of warfare and of treating captives when it fought on the west side of the Jordan and a different method when it fought on the east side of the river.

[93] 2 Kings 6: 8-24.

We, of course, do not find perfect uniformity in the Hebrew treatment of captives during the six centuries between Moses and the fall of Jerusalem. Saul's campaign against the Amalekites and David's against the Ammonites of Rabbah were characterized by a rigor that does not appear in any of the numerous victories over the Philistines, or in the conquest of the Jebusites of Jerusalem. The wars of invasion, waged to secure dwelling-places in Canaan, were naturally more fierce and desperate than, for example, the struggle of David with the Jebusites after Israel had become the dominant power in the land. It is not recorded that he put any of the inhabitants of the conquered city to the sword, but it is said that he took him concubines and wives out of Jerusalem, which not only shows that he was ignorant of a command of Yahweh his God to exterminate the Canaanites, but also suggests, at least, that his treatment of the captives was seasoned with mercy, tho this mercy may have been wholly political in character.

If now, in conclusion, we take into view the entire period of Hebrew national history between Moses and the fall of Jerusalem at the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, we may say, first, that in the treatment of captives there was, as a rule,

what from the modern point of view would be considered a most astounding disregard of human life; and, second, that it was customary to make slaves of captive women and children, especially female children. Thus the bloody character of Hebrew battles was associated with the death or enslavement of those who fell into the victor's hands. It is then no wonder that, at the close of Israel's national life, a thoughtful writer like Jeremiah or Ezekiel should have regarded war as one of the sore judgments of mankind, equaled only by famine and pestilence, which have often followed in its desolating shadow.

Chapter II

THE BIBLE ON WAR

THE great canvas that should represent to the eye the career of the Hebrews from the time of Moses to the desolation of Jerusalem would be dominated by the conception that this people who emerged from the dread solitude of Sinai in the thirteenth century B.C. and fought their way into Canaan, this people who warred almost incessantly, either with the nations round about them or with each other, until they were smitten in their mountain homes by the resistless kings of Nineveh and Babylon, were the chosen people of a warlike Yahweh. The symbol of the solemn covenant between them and Yahweh could not be wanting in any critical scene of this heroic painting. The flashing of sword and spear on countless fields of carnage, the awful din and glare and smoke of burning towns and cities on both sides of the Jordan, the barbarous massacre or life-long enslavement of women and children, can not be understood except as we take our stand on this

covenant between a fighting people and their warrior God.

To the Hebrew, war was a religious activity. When he set out on his famous march of invasion and conquest northward from Egypt, Yahweh was with him,[1] and in one of his latest visions, after nine or ten centuries had elapsed, he saw Yahweh still fighting for him in the final struggle against the nations who had gathered against Jerusalem.[2] What Abigail said to David,[3] "My Lord fighteth the battle of Yahweh," had doubtless been a part of the warlike inspiration of Israel from the most ancient times. The complement of this thought is, Yahweh will fight for you,[4] which, variously exprest, fell on the ears of Israel's militant hosts through many centuries. Israel fought with Yahweh, and Yahweh with Israel.

A survey of some aspects of this conception of Israel's wars will make it clear that we have here the most fundamental Hebrew thought on the subject of war.

And first we notice that it was customary to ascribe victory to Yahweh. Thus we are told that it was Yahweh who discomfited the hosts of

[1] Num. 10:33; 14:9; 23:21; Dt. 2:7.
[2] Zech. 14:3. [3] 1 Sam. 25:28. [4] Dt. 1:30; 3:22.

the Egyptians as they pursued Israel, who took off their chariot-wheels, or bound them fast in the mud of the Red Sea;[5] that it was Yahweh who, moved by the vow of Moses, delivered the Canaanites of Arad to the sword;[6] that it was Yahweh, who, by casting down great hailstones on the Ammonites from Beth-horon to Azekah, gave victory to Joshua;[7] that it was Yahweh who discomfited Sisera before Deborah and Barak on the battle-field of Esdraelon;[8] and Yahweh who, by his great thunder, terrified and turned back the Philistine host at Mizpah.[9] Amos, the first literary prophet, represents Yahweh himself as saying, "I destroyed the Amorite before them," that is, before Israel as he entered Canaan,[10] and in later times the psalmists dwelt upon the same thought. It was Yahweh who drove out the nations of Canaan with his hand, who marched through the wilderness before his people, who smote Sihon, king of the Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan."[11]

The presence of Yahweh on the field of battle was visibly pledged in the sacred Ark which had been brought in by the invaders from the

[5] Ex. 14:24-25. [6] Num. 21:1-3. [7] Num. 10:11.
[8] Judges 4:15. [9] 1 Sam. 7:10. [10] Amos 2:9.
[11] Ps. 68:7; 44:2; 138:19-20.

desert,[12] and which seems to have been preserved until the destruction of Jerusalem.[13] That the Ark was sometimes taken into battle, perhaps only on occasions of extreme peril, we learn from the story of Samuel's age when it was captured by the Philistines,[14] and it appears that it was taken by Joab in the campaign against the Ammonites of Rabbah.[15] But Yahweh's presence with his hosts in battle was certainly not always, even in the early times, thought to be dependent on the presence of the Ark. David, on a certain occasion, was to know that Yahweh had gone before him against the Philistines from the sound of marching in the top of the mulberry trees,[16] and the Deuteronomist supposed that from the time of Moses it had been customary for a priest to address the men of Israel when about to go into battle, and to say unto them, "Yahweh, your God, is he that goeth before you against your enemies,"[17] but at the same time the Deuteronomist never refers to the *Ark* as going into battle. His presence, therefore, was not then thought to be conditioned on the presence of the Ark. When the son of Joash with his three hundred men surrounded

[12] Josh. 3:3. [13] Jer. 3:16. [14] 1 Sam. 4:3, 11.
[15] 2 Sam. 11:11. [16] 2 Sam. 5:24. [17] Dt. 20:4.

the camp of Midian, the war-cry which they raised was, "For Yahweh and for Gideon!"[18] as tho Gideon believed that Yahweh was with him, and with him as the first in command, the invisible Leader who would lead to victory.

Again, the religious character of Hebrew warfare is seen in the fact that battles were habitually introduced with some religious rite. In the domestic strife that arose over Benjamin's sin and folly,[19] the children of Israel asked counsel of God as to which one of the tribes should begin the attack.[20] Answer was given, the attack was made, and tho the tribes were sorely defeated by Benjamin, they did not take the matter into their hands, but went to Yahweh again, and asked whether they should go against Gibeah.[21] After a second defeat they questioned Yahweh what they should do further.[22] Thus their course was determined by the agency of religion. Samuel offered a lamb by fire unto Yahweh at Mizpah, as Israel was about to join battle with the Philistines, and he cried unto

[18] Judges 7:18, 20.

[19] There are difficulties in the way of accepting this narrative as fully historical, but there is no reason to reject its witness in regard to dependence on Yahweh for direction in war.

[20] Judges 20:18. [21] Judges 20:23.

[22] Judges 20:27-28.

Yahweh in behalf of his people.[23] The result was that Yahweh intervened and discomfited the Philistines with great thunder. Gideon and David, typical Hebrews of the nobler sort, did not run into battle without being, as they believed, sent by Yahweh. Gideon built an altar in Ophrah, in the place where Yahweh had commanded him to go against the Midianites,[24] and when he came home victorious from the war he made a golden ephod for Yahweh out of the spoil of Midian.[25] David, while living as a fugitive in Judah, was yet in the habit of inquiring of Yahweh before venturing a battle with his pursuers,[26] and later, while he was a subject of Achish of Gath, he is said to have had an ephod with a priest who kept it.[27] By this he inquired of Yahweh whether he should pursue after the Amalekites, and presumably availed himself of its light on all similar occasions. After he was established as king over all Israel, when he contemplated war with the Philistines on two occasions, he still inquired of Yahweh as before.[28]

In the long ages of conflict subsequent to Solomon, tho neither Ark, nor ephod, nor

[23] 1 Sam. 7:9. [24] Judges 6:24. [25] Judges 8:27.
[26] 1 Sam. 23:2. [27] 1 Sam. 30:7. [28] 2 Sam. 5:19, 23.

urim is again mentioned in connection with warfare, the dependence of war upon the will of Yahweh was still recognized. Leaders were now made acquainted with that will by a prophet, or man of God. Thus the word of Shemaiah diverted the haughty Rehoboam from civil war,[29] and Ahab was again and again directed in war by a prophet.[30] When he joined Jehoshaphat in the campaign against the Syrians, the king of Judah requested that they should inquire for the word of Yahweh, which they did.[31] The prophet Elisha went with the army in the war with Mesha, king of Moab,[32] and his word appears to have had a decisive influence on the movement of the kings. It is not to be overlooked that Elisha went to this war on his own initiative, for his presence seems not to have been known to either of the kings. Evidently he expected that his services would be needed. Whether the kings had inquired of Yahweh through any prophet *before* setting out, one can not say with positiveness, tho there is a presumption that they had. At any rate, in their distress during the campaign, they asked for a prophet of Yahweh. Ahaz of Judah inquired of Yahweh by

[29] 1 Kings 12:22. [30] 1 Kings 20:13-15, 28, 42.
[31] 1 Kings 22:5. [32] 2 Kings 3:11.

the brazen altar in the temple, presumably in all important matters, war among the rest,[33] and Hezekiah's military policy with regard to the Assyrian king Sennacherib was determined by the prophet Isaiah.[34]

The religious epilog of war was the "devotion" of the spoil, or a part of it, to Yahweh, to be destroyed, an act whereby his wrath was supposed to be quenched,[35] or, instead of the "devotion" of the spoil, a consecration of it to Yahweh's service. We have examples of the former practise in the destruction of Arad's cities,[36] and in the campaign against Amalek,[37] and examples of the latter practise in Gideon's ephod, made of the golden earrings which were stript from the slaughtered Ishmaelites,[38] and in David's dedication to Yahweh of the silver and gold taken as spoil from Hadadezer, King of Zobah.[39] The story of the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter at the close of a successful campaign[40] suggests that the Hebrews, even as the king of Moab,[41] may at times have bought their victories in war by offerings more precious than spoil of silver and gold, or the lives of their captured foes.

[33] 2 Kings 16:15. [34] 2 Kings 18-19. [35] Num. 25:4.
[36] Num. 21:1-3. [37] 1 Kings 5:3-8. [38] Judges 8:27.
[39] 2 Sam. 8:12. [40] Judges 11:30-40. [41] 2 Kings 3:27.

We have said that in the thought of the Hebrew war was a religious activity. He entered into it at Yahweh's word; he believed that Yahweh fought with him in various ways; to Yahweh he dedicated a part of the spoil, when it was not "devoted" to him, and to him he gave the praise of victory. The question of the right or wrong of war in general, was never raised among the Hebrews, so far as we can judge from the Old Testament, and our sources never suggest that they had any doubt regarding the righteousness of the wars which they waged, either in the conquest or the defense of the land of Canaan. Just as they assumed that Yahweh was righteous, so they had no other thought than that the wars of Yahweh's people against other nations were just and necessary. They had the easy and comfortable faith that *their* foes were *Yahweh's* foes, and therefore they believed that to fight those foes was a very essential element of loyalty to Yahweh.

In the thought of the prophets of the eighth century B.C., the local and national view of Yahweh, which had prevailed from the beginning, began to give place to the conception that he is God of all peoples,[42] and with these prophets

[42] *E.g.*, Amos 9:7; Is. 2:2-3.

there also began to be a new emphasis laid on the spiritual conditions of securing Yahweh's favor. Israel is still his chosen people, but we are now familiarized with the thought of a chosen people under severe discipline. A psalmist, perhaps as late as the time of the Maccabees, laments the lot of his people, saying to Yahweh,

> Hast thou not, O God, cast us off?
> And thou goest not forth, O God, with our hosts;[43]

and another declares that Yahweh turned back the sword of his anointed in the battle.[44] He intervened to save Jerusalem in the days of Hezekiah,[45] but from that time onward for centuries he suffered his people to be subjected to foreigners. This was not thought to be a violation of his covenant with Israel, at least not by those who had high ethical views of Yahweh's character, but rather as a chastening made necessary by Israel's violation of the covenant.

But the extension of Yahweh's sovereignty, and the growing emphasis on the moral condition of his covenant, did not bring any essential modification of the Hebrew view of war. As the wars of the chosen people in early times had been judgments of Yahweh upon his and their enemies, so in the decline and fall of the two

[43] Ps. 60:10; 108:11. [44] Ps. 89:43. [45] 2 Kings 19:19.

kingdoms, the campaigns of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings were still Yahweh's judgments, but now his judgments on his own people.

It is a significant fact that from Amos onward the thought of divine judgment upon nations, and also upon individuals, is almost always set forth in military language. The herdsman of Tekoa announces judgment from Yahweh on Damascus and Gaza, Tyre and Edom, and Ammon, on Israel and Judah, and in each case his imagery is that of war.[46] In the next century Micah, the Morashtite, speaks of a judgment upon the Assyrians, which the ruler out of Bethlehem will execute with the sword,[47] and also of a judgment on the people of Yahweh, which is to come in the same form.[48] Again and again does Isaiah threaten Judah and Jerusalem with judgment from Yahweh in the form of war.[49] In the day of Yahweh, the Philistines behind, and the Syrians before, shall devour Israel with open mouth.[50] Not otherwise did he conceive of Yahweh's judgment on the nations. Thus it is by a destroying army that Yahweh will manifest his indignation toward Babylon.[51] The waters

[46] Amos 1. [47] Mic. 5:6. [48] Mic. 6:14-16.
[49] *E.g.*, Is. 1:20; 3:25; 5:26-30. [50] Is. 9:12.
[51] Is. 13:5, 17-18.

of Dimon in Moab shall be full of blood, that is, the blood of those slain in battle, and the harvest-fields of Heshbon shall be made desolate by a ruthless conqueror.[52] Yahweh's judgment in Egypt is to be in the form of civil war—Egyptians against Egyptians, city against city, and kingdom against kingdom.[53] From the drawn sword, and the bent bow, shall judgment fall on Arabia,[54] and on Edom also shall judgment be executed in the bloodshed of war.[55] The language of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, just before and shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, is like that of Isaiah. Yahweh will send the sword after his people until they are consumed,[56] and all the nations shall be made mad by the wine of his wrath, which is nothing else than the sword that he will send among them.[57] The Ammonite, who mocked Israel and the temple; the men of Moab and Seir, who said, "The house of Judah is like all the nations"; Tyre, who spoke against Jerusalem, and Egypt, who was a reed for Israel to lean upon—all these shall be desolated by the sword and wasted by war.[58] Judgment from

[52] Is. 15:9; 16:8-9. [53] Is. 19:1-4. [54] Is. 21:15.
[55] Is. 34:6. [56] Jer. 9:16.
[57] Jer. 25:15. [58] Ezek. 25:1-7, 8-11; 27; 29.

Yahweh in the form of civil war is found again in Haggai,[59] and at last, two centuries later, in the second part of Zechariah, the judgment against Javan is set forth in the striking language that Judah shall be a bow in Yahweh's hand, and Ephraim the arrow to the bow.[60]

While this conception of Yahweh's judgment on the nations, which permeates the prophetic literature of more than four hundred years, is hardly intelligible except against a deep background of national wars, and while it implies that war as known to the Hebrews, was the very climax of awful and final desolation, it also unmistakably indicates that even the moral and spiritual teachers of the Hebrews from the eighth century B.C., onward, saw a very close connection between war and the will of Yahweh. It was regarded as a conspicuous part of his government. Yet at the same time it is true that the prophets did not justify *all* wars, which is equivalent to saying that they did not associate all wars directly with Yahweh or regard them as complete expressions of his will. Thus Amos denounces some unnamed war of Edom, in which he pursued his brother with the sword, casting off all pity,[61] and Hosea denounces the carnage

[59] Hag. 2:21-22. [60] Zech. 9:13. [61] Amos 1:11.

that Jehu wrought.[62] Moreover the prophet Jeremiah declares at one time that Yahweh will give all Judah into the hand of the king of Babylon, who is his "servant," and again, that Yahweh will punish the king of Babylon and his land, because he has broken the bones of Israel.[63] War is the sword of Yahweh,[64] but the Babylonians who wage war against Jerusalem, tho in so doing they are the weapons of Yahweh's indignation and accomplish his will, are not guiltless; their deed is not wholly justifiable. Neither Jeremiah nor any one of the prophets who shares this thought with him explains himself and removes the apparent inconsistency. If Nebuchadnezzar is Yahweh's servant in his war against Judah and Jerusalem, then on what ground is his deed punishable? Surely it was then and there that he broke the bones of Israel—the fact which is given as justification of his punishment, for there is no evidence that the Jewish captives were destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar after he had taken them away to Babylon.

It is possible that in representing Nebuchadnezzar as Yahweh's servant, and his war against Jerusalem as of Yahweh, the

[62] Hos. 1:4. [63] Jer. 20:4; 25:11; 43:10; 50:17-18.
[64] Jer. 47:6.

prophet is thinking especially of the *ill desert* of Israel rather than of the character of the war against him; but however the difficulty be regarded there is, from the Hebrew point of view, no criticism to be made on war as the instrument used by Yahweh for the accomplishment of his purpose. If to the Hebrew of the earliest ages war was an activity of Yahweh himself, in the later centuries, after the rise of the great preachers of righteousness, it still remained, if not an *activity,* at least an institution, of Yahweh, as truly as to the Christian Church hell has been considered one of his institutions.

We turn from the prophets to the sacred and devotional poetry of the Hebrews. The Psalms were composed mainly in those centuries when Israel was no longer an independent people, when their great captains and kings belonged to a remote past, and for this reason the warlike note that is frequently heard in them is the more significant. Had not the singers been deeply imprest by the warlike deeds of their far-off ancestors, and had they not regarded those deeds as in some true sense the deeds of Yahweh, the God of Israel, they would hardly have blended the imagery of war with their confessions and thanksgivings, their petitions and their supplica-

tions; and had not the Jewish people as a whole shared with the Psalmists a deep regard for the warlike past of their nation, they would hardly have cherished their Psalms and have counted them at last a part of their sacred writings.

Ancient Hebrew conceptions of the warlike character of Yahweh, and of the wars of Israel as his wars, underlie many a strain in the Psalms; and the ease with which the singers express their deepest longing in language borrowed from the field of battle bears eloquent witness both to the fact that war had formed a considerable part of the life of their forefathers and also to the fact that they accepted it as a sort of divine institution. In illustration of these thoughts let the military element of the Psalms be briefly considered.

Yahweh is a rock, a fortress, a high tower, and a shield to his people[65]—all images of defensive war. But the active and hostile imagery also is not lacking in the Psalmist's thought of his God. Thus he has a sword and a bow.[66] He whets the sword and makes ready the bow-strings.[67] He takes hold of shield and buckler, and stands up for the help of his people.[68] He draws out the

[65] Ps. 18:2; 9:9; 28:7.
[66] Ps. 7:12.
[67] Ps. 7:12; 21:12.
[68] Ps. 35:2.

spear, and stops the way against them that pursue his chosen.[69] He has 20,000 chariots, and is mighty in battle.[70] He marched through the wilderness before his people, and showed them the power of his works in giving them the heritage of the nations.[71] He smote many nations and slew mighty kings in the early time, and yet again, in the future, at the right hand of his anointed, he will smite through kings in the day of his wrath.[72] He overthrew cities of old, he broke gates of brass, and cut in sunder bars of iron,[73] that he might enter the stronghold of an enemy and take his life. One psalmist prays that God will repeat his ancient exploits against Midian and Sisera, Oreb and Zeeb, Zeba and Zalmunna, and thus cut off the tents of Edom, cut off Moab and the Hagrites, Gebal and Ammon, Amalek, Philistia, Tyre, and Assyria.[74] The author of the 78th Psalm, in depicting a critical hour in Israel's history, uses this strongly anthropomorphic language:

> Then the Lord awaked as one out of sleep,
> Like a mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine.
> And he smote his adversaries backward,
> He put them to a perpetual reproach.[75]

[69] Ps. 35:3. [70] Ps. 68:17; 24:8. [71] Ps. 111:6.
[72] Ps. 135:10; 110:5. [73] Ps. 9:6; 107:16.
[74] Ps. 83:6-11. [75] Ps. 78:65-66.

Thus Yahweh is likened to the *gibborim,* the heroes of sword and spear.

But the God of Israel is not only a "man of war" himself, he also teaches others the art and makes them mighty in battle. In the old song of 2 Sam. 22, David ascribes to Yahweh all his skill and strength:

By thee I run upon a troop,
By my God do I leap over a wall.
He teacheth my hands to war
So that my arms do bend a bow of brass.
Thou hast girded me with strength unto the battle,
Thou hast subdued under me those that rose up against me.

This thought is repeated, after an interval of perhaps five hundred years, in Ps. 144, whose author blesses Yahweh,

Who teacheth my hands to war
And my fingers to fight.

In full accord with the sentiment of these poets is the writer of the book of Judges,[76] who conceived that Yahweh left in Canaan some of the inhabitants in order that the generations of Israel might learn war, might have near at hand a practical school of military discipline!

Such is the warlike strain in the Hebrew poet's conception of Yahweh. Tho most conspicuous in

[76] Judges 3:2.

this relation, it is by no means wholly confined to it. Let some other illustrations be noted.

Psalm 45 is a marriage song for some unnamed and unknown king. Prominent in the splendid array of his person is the sword girded upon the thigh; this is his glory and his majesty. His arrows are so sharp and so skilfully aimed that they reach the heart of his foes. Obviously the ideal king for the writer of this poem must not lack strength and skill to wield the sword and to handle the bow. The writer saw nothing incongruous in the coupling together of gracious speech and warlike array, even as the writer of Ps. 149 thought it fitting that the saints should have the high praises of God in their mouth and a two-edged sword in their hand.[77] Not to be ready to fight was to refuse to walk in God's law and to keep his covenant. To the shame of Ephraim it is said that, tho armed and carrying bows, they turned back in the day of battle.[78] Finally, the Psalms set forth the security of the people of Yahweh in terms that are taken from war. Thus we read:

> Tho a host should encamp against me,
> My heart shall not fear;
> Tho war should rise against me,
> Even then will I be confident;

[77] Ps. 149:6. [78] Ps. 78:9.

and again:

> A thousand shall fall at thy side
> And ten thousand at thy right hand,
> But it shall not come nigh thee.[79]

Thus in the very sanctuary of the Hebrews, and in their meditations on Yahweh and the soul's relation to him we are reminded of the field of battle and carnage, we see the instruments of war, the marching hosts, the flight of arrows, the sword smiting through the head, the breaching of strong walls, and the burning of war-chariots in the fire. We hear the shout of mighty men intoxicated with peril and the hissing of the bowstring from which an arrow has sped to the heart of some human being.

It is no wonder that men familiar with the Psalms, as was Oliver Cromwell, should recall one and another passage to arouse their courage as they rush madly into battle. For tho the Psalter contains many tender and spiritual words, it contains also the language and the sentiments of a Hebrew battle-field. A drastic revision and expurgation of the Psalms, as of the entire Old Testament, is a clear and pressing Christian duty.

When we pass from the Old Testament to the New we leave war and battle-fields behind us.

[79] Ps. 27:3; 91:7.

The change of atmosphere and spirit in this respect is complete. The transition from winter to spring furnishes only a very imperfect analogy to what we witness here. Of Yahweh mighty in battle, Yahweh who is a "man of war," who strikes through kings in the day of his wrath; of Yahweh clad in warlike array, drawing out the spear, whetting the sword, and marching before the hosts of Israel to discomfit their enemies and his, we hear no more. Scarce a faint echo of the voice of that Yahweh is heard from the pages of the New Testament. But the thought of him which the great prophets learned to think, tho imperfectly, is now supreme. Instead of a warlike Yahweh, we have the heavenly Father. And the New Testament people of Yahweh, those who take Jesus as teacher and leader, are never armed with weapons of the old earthly warfare, with sword and spear and bow. They are never marshaled to fight against the foes of their God, for their God *has* no foes in human form; he has only children.

The ideal man of this New Testament people of Yahweh is no David, whether descended from that bold soldier or not. Jesus is the very antipode of the famous son of Jesse. He was surrounded, indeed, by enemies of his people, as was

David, but he did not take up the sword against them, or teach others so to do. He saw his people subject to Rome, and saw the city which David had won from the Jebusites with the edge of the sword ruled by one of Rome's representatives, yet he did not even utter a word against it. He had heard, as a boy, and he knew from experience in later life, of the purpose of some of his fellow Jews to rise against the Roman and either to gain their independence or perish in the attempt, but he never showed the slightest sympathy with this radical, yet plainly suicidal, purpose. We can not doubt that David, unlike Jesus, would have been with the party of Zealots, body and soul. Jesus was probably aware that he could kindle a general rising against Rome, and that he had only to speak the word in order to be crowned king of his Galilean countrymen, but far from speaking that word, he declared that his people should render to Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's and he fled from the face of those who wanted to make him their king. Soldiers must have been a common sight to Jesus, both in Capernaum, which was situated on one of the great thoroughfares to Damascus and the East, and also in Jerusalem, and of bloody wars he must have heard much, for the generation before

his was one of awful carnage both on the broad stage of the Roman Empire and in the little land of Palestine, but he, tho a friend of the poor and a lover of his people, had no direct message in regard to war.

The difference between the early Hebrew type of great man and the type which Jesus sought to develop may be seen in this, that while David taught the children of Israel the *Song of the Bow,* and said to the high praise of Yahweh,

> By thee I run upon a troop,
> By my God do I leap over a wall,

Jesus taught his disciples the way of self-denial and service, and praised God that he had revealed to the humble the spiritual truth of his kingdom.

But the teaching of Jesus, tho having no formal message in regard to war, is unmistakably and irrevocably opposed to the warlike spirit. By this is not meant, of course, that he consciously declared war against war. He no more did this than he consciously and formally rejected such early and inadequate conceptions of God as that he is "a man of war." What he did was to live and teach a conception of God and man which forever condemns the warlike spirit, which shuts

it out of the heart as light shuts out darkness. Jesus preaches a kingdom in which war is clearly impossible, unthinkable. This kingdom is the rule of a heavenly Father among his children. Therefore the beatitudes of Jesus include peacemakers, the meek and the merciful.[80] For the same reason, Jesus must declare that every man who is angry with his brother is in danger of the judgment,[81] that his disciples must love their enemies,[82] that they must not resist him that is evil,[83] that they must forgive men who trespass against them,[84] and must consider that they are in the world, as he was, to minister unto others.[85] Because God is the Father of man, to love him with all the heart and to love our neighbors as ourselves is the sum of religious and moral duty. The Father does not hate, does not quarrel and fight, therefore his children should not.

But the question arises whether this doctrine of unlimited forgiveness and of non-resistance to him who is evil is qualified by any act or saying of Jesus. In other words, does he teach the doctrine of *absolute* non-resistance to him that is evil? In answer to this question one must say that if absolute non-resistance to him who is evil

[80] Matt. 5:7, 9. [81] Matt. 5:22. [82] Matt. 5:44.
[83] Matt. 5:39. [84] Matt. 6:15. [85] Mark 10:45.

is involved in the obligation to love God with all the heart and to love one's neighbor as one's self, then Jesus stands for absolute non-resistance. But is that the case?

It is not denied that the conduct of Jesus squared with his teaching. It is not denied that he loved God with all his heart and loved his neighbor as himself, yea, better than himself. But the conduct of Jesus showed a decided resistance to the evil man. When he was smitten before the high priest, he protested,[86] and protest is a kind of resistance. Therefore, the conduct of Jesus himself, by which we should interpret any uncertain word in his teaching on the subject in question, forbids our saying that he taught *absolute* non-resistance to him who is evil. Not less obvious is it, in view of his own conduct, that he would not have his disciples use physical force to prevent his arrest, tho he protested against that arrest and the violent manner in which it was carried out. If he spoke to his disciples on that occasion of the need of "swords," he did not allow the moment to pass without indicating unmistakably that he used the term as a symbol and not in a literal sense. When one of those near him said there were two swords at hand, he re-

[86] Mark 14:48-49.

plied, "It is enough."[87] Surely he was not thinking of physical defense.

We may recall in this connection the word that Jesus spoke about the bearing of his disciples when, in their turn, they should be brought before governors and kings because of their religion.[88] He was confident that in their hour of need they would have divine help, but it would be help to speak the right word, not to discomfit their enemies with the sword. Thus in his own case, when arrested, and in the case of his followers in their witness-bearing, it is plain that Jesus did not entertain the thought of physical resistance. But it would be unwarranted to infer from these two special incidents the general principle that, in the thought of Jesus, physical resistance to him who is evil is never to be tolerated. Therefore, we turn back again to the great, positive, fundamental principle of love, and ask whether physical resistance to him who is evil is absolutely incompatible with that. To love one's children as one's self, or even better than one's self, is not usually thought to be inconsistent with the principle of physical resistance to them if they are evil; but if that be so, then it would appear as tho love of the fellow man were not absolutely in-

[87] Luke 22:38. [88] Mark 13:11.

consistent with physical resistance to him when evil. But, of course, it is idle to argue the point in this manner with a hope of reaching perfect certainty as to what *Jesus* thought. Because *we* think that the supreme obligation to love God and our neighbor does not exclude physical resistance to him who is evil, it does not inevitably follow that it was not excluded in the thought of Jesus.

There can be no doubt that, in the view of Jesus, love is the supreme law of the religious and the moral life. It is equally plain that where the Kingdom of God has been fully established war is unthinkable. It is also beyond question that neither the words nor the example of Jesus can be appealed to in support of a doctrine of strictly *absolute* non-resistance to him who is evil. For both his example and his word allow *moral* resistance, and we can not affirm that they altogether exclude the possibility of *physical* resistance. Yet while there is and may, perhaps, forever be a chance for difference of opinion whether, in the thought of the Master, the law of love can ever tolerate physical resistance to him who is evil, one great fact is clear, namely, that his unquestionable teaching puts constant and supreme emphasis upon the attainment of unwarlike qualities—meekness, unselfishness, willingness to for-

give injury, mercifulness, trust in our fellow men, the habit of not judging others, and the settled principle that life is meant for service.

In view of this perfectly clear trend in the teaching of Jesus we must hold that physical resistance to him who is evil hardly entered into his thought as possible among his disciples, and must regard it as probable that, had he been asked whether physical resistance to him who is evil is ever the duty of an individual or a people, he would in some manner have brought home to the questioner the fundamental duty of brotherliness, and would have left him free to decide whether, in any specific situation, physical resistance was consistent with the fulfilment of that duty. It was not his way to lay down rules of conduct, but to reveal and enforce vital principles of life.

Before passing from the teaching of Jesus a word should be devoted to certain sayings of his which, tho they are incidental in character, and, however interpreted, do not seriously affect the conclusions already reached, might by themselves appear to modify those conclusions. There is, first, the solemn word about the foreseen result of his mission: "I came not to send peace, but a sword."[89] This was a recognition that men would

[89] Mark 10:34; Luke 12:51.

be divided by his teaching, indeed, they were at the moment when he was speaking. This, however, is a result of the activity of every great teacher. Ezra, the scribe, sent a "sword" on earth, so did Martin Luther and George Fox. The more unique and forcible the teacher the sharper the division he creates. The word implies nothing at all as to the attitude of Jesus' disciples toward those who reject him or reject them. It simply recognizes that, with the planting and growth of his message, division is inevitable.

Again, in the discourse about the consummation of the present age, Jesus is represented as saying to his disciples: "Ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars; see that ye be not troubled: for these things must needs come to pass."[90] We need not consider here whether these are words of Jesus, or are borrowed from the current belief of the Jews, for in any case they do not contemplate a participation in war by the *disciples*. They foreshadow a time of stress for the disciples, but this stress is due to the fightings of those who are not disciples.[91]

We turn now for a moment to other New

[90] Matt. 24:6; Mark 13:7; Luke 21:9.

[91] Matt. 26:52 is not supported by Mark 14:47 nor by Luke 22:51.

Testament teachers, not because the word of Jesus needs confirmation, but to see whether the teachers of the earliest time confirm what seems to us at present to be the true understanding of the word of Jesus.

Jesus was not always understood by the disciples of the first century, even as he is not always understood by those of the twentieth, but on the subject in hand those early Christians whose writings found a place in the New Testament are in substantial agreement with each other, and appear to have had the same conception of the teaching of Jesus that we derive from our oldest sources.

Of Paul's thought we have the fullest information. Strife he regarded as a work of the flesh, and peace as a fruit of the Spirit.[92] God is for him the God of Peace, and his kingdom one of peace as well as of righteousness.[93] He admits that it may not always be possible for the Roman believers to be at peace with all men, but even if they can not be, they are not to avenge themselves, but to overcome evil with good.[94] Since he regarded it as a moral defect in the Corinthian Christians that they had *law suits* among themselves, it would seem as tho he must have con-

[92] Gal. 5:19-20. [93] Rom. 16:20; 14:17.
[94] Rom. 12:18-21.

sidered it a monstrous anomaly that those who are called Christians, whether individuals or nations, should fight each other on battle-fields. The armor that God gives, according to Paul, is not, as in ancient times, a bow and spear and sword, wherewith to wound and destroy, but it is such weapons as truth and righteousness and peace. The only divine sword that he knows is the word of God.[95] In a letter that may be later than Paul the loyal disciple is styled a "good soldier" of Christ Jesus, but the one point of soldiership in view in the passage is the ability to *endure hardship*.[96] The emphasis that Jesus put on the attainment of unwarlike qualities is faithfully echoed in the writings of Paul and in other parts of the New Testament. He walks worthily of the Christian calling, we read, who is forgiving and tender-hearted, and who keeps the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.[97] Both Paul and Peter counsel profound regard for the established government,[98] tho one regards government as ordained of God and the other as a creation of man. Neither saying contemplates the relation of one government or state to another and, therefore, does not contemplate the possibility of war be-

[95] Eph. 6:11-18.
[96] 2 Tim. 2:3.
[97] Eph. 4:1-3, 32.
[98] Rom. 13:1; 1 Pt. 2:13.

tween nations. It hardly needs to be said that each was intended for certain specific conditions and can not at once be given a universal application.

There is but a single reference in the New Testament to the warlike exploits of the ancient Hebrews,[99] and that celebrates them merely as wrought through faith in their God. The Sermon on the Mount is echoed in the words of James, that heavenly wisdom is peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits.[100] There is but one writing in the New Testament that reminds us at all of the warlike books of the Old Testament, and even this is widely different from them. For tho the Apocalypse talks much of bloodshed, tho its red horse comes forth out of the book of the future with authority to take peace from the earth,[101] the disciples of Jesus are never represented as participating in the carnival of blood. In the one great scene in which they appear as an *army* and are said to be proceeding against the enemies of God, they are unarmed, clad in white linen, and riding on white horses.[102] Their leader also has no warlike weapon; he overthrows his adversaries by his mere *word*.

[99] Heb. 11:32-39. [100] Jas. 3:17.
[101] Rev. 6:4. [102] Rev. 19:11-16.

We may now briefly sum up on the entire ground covered. To the ancient Hebrews Yahweh was warlike, and war was regarded by them as a religious activity. The typical hero before the exile was David, who not only sang of sword and spear but who also excelled in their use. To the Founder of the Christian faith, on the other hand, God is the heavenly Father, and his kingdom is one of pure love. Jesus does not *teach,* or necessarily imply, absolute physical non-resistance to him who is evil, but by word and life he puts supreme emphasis on the attainment of unwarlike qualities. His spirit differs from that of David as widely as the heavenly Father differs from the warlike Yahweh. Jesus was foreshadowed not by the military son of Jesse but by the suffering servant of Second Isaiah. The New Testament writers, like their Master, not only have no formal message about war, but they emphasize the thought that the characteristic Christian qualities are unwarlike.

Whether the Church of subsequent times has been responsive to the teaching of Jesus or to that of the Old Testament, he who runs may read on the pages of Christian history, and he who reads must lay his hand upon his mouth.

Chapter III

PEACE IN THE BIBLICAL VISIONS OF A GOLDEN AGE

THE ancient Hebrews had a warlike career. They fought the battles of Yahweh from century to century. But when at last their national existence was no more, when they sat and sighed by the ruins of their holy city or far away among the nations, some among them dreamed of a new and wondrous age that was yet to come. They thought of their past, glorified, indeed, in the far retrospect, but they did not long to have those ages return unchanged. They dreamed of a future that should be far better than the best that their fathers had ever known, and one constant element of that great future—one on which they dwelt with satisfaction—was peace. Out of the soil of centuries of strife and bloodshed blossomed, as a fair flower, the vision of a time when peace should flow as a river. By this vision the Hebrew prophets became leaders of the race toward a future kingdom whose realization is still among the treasures of hope.

To this vision, but more particularly to its ele-

ment of peace, we must give careful thought lest our study of the fact of war in Biblical history convey a fragmentary and inadequate view of Israel's entire thought.

The dream of a future ideal kingdom arose on the basis of a kingdom that had been realized and that was now sinking to its certain fall, or had already fallen. Our sources of information, therefore, date from the time when the fate of Israel and Judah seemed to the prophets to be irrevocably fixt. The three political events which occasioned the most clearly defined and also the most abundant utterances regarding the ideal future were the approach of the Assyrian power at the close of the eighth century B.C., the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., and the destruction of the Babylonian kingdom by Cyrus in 539 B.C. It was in view of the first of these events that Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah caught glimpses of the ideal future; in view of the second, Jeremiah spoke and wrote; and in view of the last, a part, at least, of Isaiah 40-66 was composed. References in the Psalms to the ideal future, both those which are general in character and those that may concern an individual king or the Davidic *line,* are most easily understood as written after the fall of Jerusalem.

The ideal future of Israel is invariably bound up, in these sources, with the land which Yahweh gave to the fathers, the same land which had been drenched with the blood of a thousand battles in the centuries gone. Tho the vision of the prophets may occasionally touch the supernatural, it is never loosed from Jerusalem and Palestine.

With Amos, the shepherd-prophet of Tekoa, the ideal future is naturally set forth in rural imagery. In that golden time the mountains shall drop sweet wine and all the hills shall melt, the plowman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed.[1] This line of thought is variously expanded and enriched by later writers in their descriptions of the material side of the ideal future. The wilderness is to become as a fruitful field, and the fruitful field of the present will then be esteemed as a forest.[2] There shall be brooks and streams of water on every mountain and hill, and even the waste places shall be as the garden of Eden.[3]

While this picture of agricultural prosperity implies peace both at home and with surrounding nations, this element begins to be explicitly dwelt

[1] Amos 9:13.

[2] Is. 32:15; 29:17; Jer. 31:12; Ezek. 34:13-16.

[3] Is. 30:25; Ezek. 36:25; Is. 51:3.

upon by Hosea. First, there shall be peace between man and the creatures lower than man, for Yahweh will make a covenant of peace with wild beasts and birds and creeping things.[4] But peace between man and the various creatures of Palestine that injured man appears, in Hosea, as an introduction to a nobler peace, for Yahweh says, "I will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the land, and I will make them to lie down safely. And I will betroth thee unto me forever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in justice and in loving kindness and in mercies. I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness; and thou shalt know Yahweh."[5] Here is peace, and here we are led up to the highest source of peace.

Hosea's picture of peace between man and beast is somewhat modified by Ezekiel.[6] He also would have man untroubled by wild beasts in the future, but to him it seems best to secure this end, not by a covenant of peace, but by the *extermination* of evil creatures that prey upon man. Then only can God's people dwell securely in the wilderness and sleep in the woods unharmed.

Isaiah, the city-bred man, sees the ideal fu-

[4] Hos. 2:18. [5] Hos. 2:18-20. [6] Ezek. 34:25.

ture as a glorified Jerusalem. Yahweh will create over the whole habitation of Mount Zion and over her assemblies a cloud and smoke by day and the shining of a flaming fire by night.[7] Later prophets elaborate this conception. Thus we read that the new Zion is to be a glory to Yahweh himself.[8] It is to be a crown of beauty, a royal diadem in the hand of God.[9] It will be enlarged, and its environs will be purified,[10] for example, the valley of Gehenna where Moloch had been worshiped. Its sanctuary will be made glorious,[11] and the city's new name will express Yahweh's delight in it.[12] Above this new Zion in a renewed land the light of the moon shall be as that of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be increased sevenfold, or, in the still more daring imagery of Second Isaiah, the sun and the moon shall be replaced by the everlasting light of God's own glory.[13] This vision, like the foregoing, breathes "exceeding peace."

> No war nor battle sound
> Is heard the world around.

There is one more step in our approach to the inner meaning of the prophetic vision of an ideal

[7] Is. 4:5. [8] Jer. 33:9. [9] Is. 62:3.
[10] Jer. 31:38-40. [11] Is. 60:13. [12] Is. 62:4.
[13] Is. 30:26; 60:19.

future kingdom. We have touched on the material aspect of the land and the city as they were to be in some coming time. We notice, further, that the references to the people of country and city in that time are intelligible only in an era of peace. They are to blossom as the lily and cast forth their roots as Lebanon,[14] a little one shall become a thousand and a small one a strong nation;[15] they shall be multiplied until their ancient patrimony shall be too strait for them.[16] Moreover, in that good time, no one shall say, "I am sick,"[17] and the days of the life of a man shall be as the life of a tree.[18] Once, indeed, the prophetic language rises to the bold assertion that death shall be swallowed up forever,[19] which is probably to be regarded as affirming no more than that very long life shall be the lot of those who shall dwell in the fair land of the ideal future. It is, perhaps, equivalent to the word that the "child" shall die an hundred years old.[20] The inhabitants shall be free from alarm and fear: peace shall be extended to them like a river.[21] These general references to the un-

[14] Hosea 14:5-6. [15] Is. 60:22; Zech. 14:8.
[16] Jer. 30:19; Ezek. 36:10-11; 37:26; Zech. 10:10.
[17] Is. 33:24. [18] Is. 65:22. [19] Is. 25:8.
[20] Is. 65:20. [21] Is. 66:12.

limited expansion and undisturbed long life of man in the good age to come plainly imply that it is thought of as an age of peace.

But we must go on to a closer study of the heirs of that great age. On the character of the coming man not a little is said in the prophetic passages with which we are dealing.

The men who are left when Yahweh makes a "full end" of judgment in the land,[22] and they who are to be gathered from among the nations whither they have been scattered, are a "remnant," merely the good "kernels" which Yahweh finds among the bad and in the chaff.[23] The "remnant" does not consist of *perfect* men, but of those who are purified and greatly ennobled. They are still liable to do wrong, and will need further purification. According to Jeremiah there will still be sacrifices and offerings in the ideal future.[24] Even the hopeful prophet of the Exile, tho seeing in his vision a city and a land in which Yahweh will take delight,[25] a Zion whose children shall all be taught of God,[26] and all righteous,[27] nevertheless saw a *temple* in this new Zion,[28] and, naturally, a temple implied a ritual of sacrifice.

[22] Is. 11:22-23. [23] Amos 9:9. [24] Jer. 33:18, 22.
[25] Is. 62:5. [26] Is. 54:13. [27] Is. 61:13.
[28] Is. 44:28.

The superior quality of men in the ideal future is often indicated by one of two closely related terms, either they *know* Yahweh, or they are intimately *associated* with him. This language is deeply suggestive. Hosea says that the Israel of the future shall address Yahweh as *Ishi,* that is, My Husband,[29] and he on his part shall rejoice over them as a bridegroom over his bride.[30] They shall know Yahweh with a knowledge which is both insight and reverence. That knowledge is the basis of Isaiah's vision of peace,[31] the fruit of Jeremiah's new heart-covenant,[32] and what is promised to all the children of Zion.[33] It is a knowledge not taught by man but by Yahweh himself.[34] And this new knowledge bears fruit in life. Justice and righteousness prevail even in the wilderness.[35] Both the ruler and they who are ruled are stamped with the righteousness of Yahweh himself.[36] Out of this root springs a great and abiding joy, coupled with universal peace.[37] Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.[38] The breach in the kingdom shall be healed forever.[39]

[29] Hosea 2:16. [30] Is. 62:5; Zeph. 3:17.
[31] Is. 11:9. [32] Jer. 31:34. [33] Is. 54:13.
[34] Is. 54:13. [35] Is. 32:15. [36] Jer. 23:6; 33:16
[37] Jer. 31:12; Is. 35:10; 51:11; 65:19. [38] Is. 11:13.
[39] Ezek. 37:16-22.

The villages shall be without walls.[40] Judgment from Yahweh shall fall upon horses and chariots, even as upon soothsayers and idols.[41] Implements of warfare and garments rolled in blood, all the old and hated paraphernalia of battle and death, shall be given to the flames.[42]

The nations also, as well as Israel, shall be at peace. They shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning-hooks.[43] The chariots of war shall be cut off from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off, for Yahweh will speak peace to the nations.[44]

The international outlook in the ideal future calls for a somewhat fuller consideration. When Yahweh was God of Israel alone, all foreigners were theoretically enemies, but with the growth of the conception of Yahweh as the God of all peoples, tho he still had a special covenant with Israel, the attitude of Israel toward the nations, as reflected in the prophets, became more friendly. Isaiah saw many nations spontaneously flowing toward Jerusalem in the great future,[45] attracted thither by the exaltation of the house of Yahweh, somewhat as the Queen of Sheba

[40] Ezek. 38:11. [41] Mic. 5:10-11. [42] Is. 9:5.
[43] Is. 2:4. [44] Zech. 9:10. [45] Is. 2:3.

had been attracted by the far splendor of Solomon's reign. And these nations have confidence that they will be well received, and that Yahweh will teach them of his ways. Not less remarkable is Isaiah's vision of a new Egypt and a new Assyria,[46] which were to be contemporary with the new Israel. The highways between these nations, which in past centuries had been trodden by the armies of Egypt and Assyria going forth to war, shall, in the great age to come, be freely used by the two peoples in the mutual exchange of commerce. Instead of fighting against each other they shall worship together, and their worship shall be of Yahweh.

The breadth and freedom of these visions are paralleled only by that of Isaiah 25, which belongs to a much later age. According to this surprizing document, Yahweh is to give a great banquet in Zion to all the nations, and at the same time he is to take away the "veil" which is spread over them. The nations are to come forth into the light and joy which Yahweh gives. There is no hint of political subjection to Israel.

In many of the visions of an ideal future Israel's political supremacy over other peoples is exprest or implied. It is sternly set forth in

[46] Is. 19:18-25.

Psalm 2, where Yahweh's "anointed" is described as one who shall break the nations with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. A gentler spirit colors the language of Psalm 72. All kings are, indeed, to fall down before the King of Israel, according to the author of this psalm, and all nations are to serve him, but they are also to be blest in him and to call him happy.[47] The government of the future is here regarded as a benevolent Israelitish despotism. The visions of Second Isaiah have an outlook on universal peace, but it is a peace of the peoples of the earth in subjection to Israel. The men of Egypt and Ethiopia and the Sabeans come to the chosen people of Yahweh as tributaries, altho their motive in coming is presented as a purely religious one. The kings and queens of the nations shall bow down to Israel with their faces to the ground and, in the extravagant hyperbole of the Orient, shall lick the dust of Israel's feet.[48] They shall bring their wealth and their glory as tribute to Yahweh's people. If they refuse, they shall be utterly wasted.[49]

In the latest prophetic vision of the ideal future, which dates from the deep and terrible

[47] Ps. 72:11, 17. [48] Is. 49:23. [49] Is. 60:11-12.

blackness of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, the kingdom and the dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven are to be given to the saints of the most high, that is to say, a purified Israel is to have world-wide and perpetual sway.[50]

The international outlook in the visions of a golden future is sometimes obscured by the clouds of war, tho domestic strife is banished from Israel's history. The age-long antipathies between Israel and surrounding nations occasionally cast their shadow over the bright scene that rises before the prophet's inner eye. Thus in Isaiah's dream of a time when the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, when Ephraim shall not envy Judah nor Judah vex Ephraim, Israel is, nevertheless, to fly down upon the shoulder of the Philistines on the west, as a bird of prey drops upon its unsuspecting quarry, and it shall also despoil the children of the East.[51] Ezekiel also allows the peace of the ideal future to be invaded by war from a far country. The hordes of Gog are to come up against Israel when he is dwelling securely in unwalled towns. But even in this extremity of peril Israel will not be called upon to fight, for Yahweh himself will meet the invader

[50] Dan. 7:27. [51] Is. 11:14.

with pestilence, with hailstones, with fire and brimstone. In addition to all this, every man's sword shall be against his brother, and thus the great host of enemies will be overthrown. Whether the prophet thought of this slaughter of God's host as rounding out the sad record of earthly wars and marking the dawn of a strictly universal peace, we can not say.

Later than this vision of Ezekiel, and more comprehensive in its severity toward the nations at or near the beginning of Israel's ideal future, is the outlook of Joel. When Judah shall have been gathered home into his native land, then all the nations, or at least all those that have scattered and opprest Israel, are to be assembled, judged, and destroyed in the valley of Jehoshaphat.[52] That will be a time when the mighty men of Israel must beat their plowshares into swords and their pruning-hooks into spears, for, unlike the vision of Ezekiel, this one of Joel makes men the executioners of Yahweh's judgment. The outlook here is on peace, but, so far as those nations are concerned that have injured Israel, a peace gained through the extermination of the enemy.

The unknown prophet whose writing forms the

[52] Joel 3:1-13.

second part of our book of Zechariah has yet a different view of what shall be among the peoples in that great future when Jerusalem dwells safely and when Yahweh is king over all the earth.[53] Those that are left of the nations will regard Jerusalem as their holy city, and will keep the feast of tabernacles there year by year.[54] The prophet apparently anticipated that there might be some unwillingness on the part of the nations thus to observe the Jewish feast and, therefore, he added a threat for those who should refuse.[55] The sword of man appears no more, and all the earth is subject to Yahweh. True, the vision is not one of perfect brotherhood, for, under the influence of hereditary hatred, the Canaanite is excluded from the house of Yahweh,[56] and in that exclusion lies a seed of bitterness and so of possible strife.

Such, briefly sketched, was the element of peace in the dreams of an ideal future which came to utterance among the prophets of Israel during the long centuries of captivity and political dependence which intervened between Amos and Antiochus Epiphanes.

We can not fail to observe that this peace of

[53] Zech. 14:9, 11. [54] Zech. 14:6. [55] Zech. 14:17, 19.
[56] Zech. 14:21.

which the prophets of Israel wrote was conceived as a gift of Yahweh. Were we to fix our thought wholly on these visions of an ideal future, ignoring for the time all present environment of the successive prophets, we might almost say that the early conception of Yahweh as a "man of war" and "mighty in battle" had given place to a conception of him as the God of peace. The Hebrew vision of brotherhood was not yet perfect, especially as regards the relation of Israel to other peoples, but it was, nevertheless, for those times, a celestial vision, and its inspiration flowed from the conception of a covenant between Yahweh and his people. The peace of the Golden Age was not thought to spring out of commercial and economic principles, it was not conceived of or desired as the handmaid of civilization, but it was Yahweh's gift, first to his chosen nation and through them to the world. Whoever in the present day appropriates the hope of the Hebrew vision of universal peace is bound to give thoughtful attention to the original foundation of that hope.

We say the *hope* of the vision. More than twenty-six centuries have passed since Hosea spoke of a day when Yahweh would break the

bow and the sword and the battle out of the land, and would make his people lie down safely,[57] and since the bold seer of Jerusalem dreamed of a future when all nations should flow together unto the house of Yahweh,[58] and yet the vision tarries. We speak from the point of view of the prophets. What they looked for in the ideal future has never, for the most part at least, come to pass. The great pacific king of Isaiah's vision did not come in Hezekiah or in any one of all his successors on the throne of Judah, nor did the event that was to have immediately preceded it, namely, the breaking of Assyria's power, come to pass. Egypt was not brought to Yahweh, and therefore did not lead Assyria to worship the God of Israel, and the two were not—and now, from the very nature of the case, can never be—a blessing with Israel in the midst of the earth. The ideal future of which Jeremiah spoke did not dawn after seventy years,[59] nor did the Davidic deliverer of Ezekiel arise at the close of the forty years' desolation and captivity of Egypt.[60] The ideal future of Israel did not dawn with the return of the exiles in the reign of Cyrus,[61] neither was Zerubbabel

[57] Hosea 2:18. [58] Is. 2:2. [59] Jer. 29:10.
[60] Ezek. 29:13-21. [61] Is. 41:45; 60.

the Davidic king who should bring in the long-expected day.[62]

As with these anticipations that contained an element of time, so with all the others of a like sort. The vision of Yahweh's glory in the restored Zion—a city most splendid, a temple surpassing that of Solomon, the Shekinah rendering sun and moon unnecessary—did not come to realization in the Jewish community that was built up after the Exile. The reign of peace among the nations and peace in Nature did not begin. The restored people were not multiplied until they overflowed into Gilead and Lebanon, the land was not more fertile, nor the hills and mountains more plentifully supplied with brooks, life was not prolonged so that a "child" died an hundred years old, nor was the measure of prosperity which was enjoyed secure from one generation to another. Judah and Israel were not reunited on the return from Babylon, indeed, Israel never returned. As for the people who came back to Jerusalem from the East, they were indeed a "remnant," doubtless a choice remnant with regard to their loyalty to Yahweh and their patriotic devotion to Zion, but the literature that deals with post-exilic history, for example, the

[62] Hagg. 2:23; Zech. 4:9; 6:12.

prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, plainly shows that they were not a people uniquely taught of Yahweh and established in righteousness, a people who had his law in their hearts and who knew him, a people over whom he rejoiced as a bridegroom over his bride.

But we must not stop here. The prophets themselves were well aware that prophetic expectations had been disappointed, and yet they did not cease to speak with confidence of God's purposes for Zion. Isaiah, in 734 B.C., expected, within a short time, the Davidic prince who would inaugurate the new age, and then, a generation later, in 702 B.C., tho his former expectation had not been fulfilled, he spoke again, with equal assurance, of the turning back of the Assyrian invader and the dawn of the ideal future.[63] The invader was, indeed, turned back,[64] Jerusalem was saved, but the hoped-for age was not therewith inaugurated. A century later, in the new crisis that had arisen with the approach of the Babylonian power, Jeremiah put the new future, which Isaiah had expected in his own day, on beyond a captivity of long duration. Still later by many years the unknown author of Isaiah 40-56 associated the ideal future of Israel

[63] Is. 30. [64] 2 Kings 19:35-36.

with the return from Babylon which was to take place in the near future. The fact that this hope was not realized did not prevent the much later author of Zech. 14 from picturing an ideal future when Yahweh should be king over all the earth.

Thus the vision of a Golden Age, which had begun to dawn in the eighth century B.C., did not fade into the light of common day, tho its realization was again and again confidently but vainly expected. As time passed and events succeeded one another, it underwent various modifications more or less important, but the succession of hopeful prophets, undeterred by its failure to appear, and abating no jot of confidence, looked for its realization at no very remote day.

This persistency of hope, taken together with the fact of a considerable element of change in successive visions of the ideal future, seems to show that the prophets were not greatly concerned with the particular details of their visions, but that they were established in certain great principles of Yahweh's character and will. Their thought of times and seasons, of agents and methods of fulfilment, of fit material and political accompaniments of the coming ideal state, might vary one from another, and might all be

very imperfect or even quite wrong, they still held to an ideal perfecting of Yahweh's gracious will in and through his chosen people.

This hope of an ideal future, which was still alive in the age of Antiochus Epiphanes, as one may see from the book of Daniel, survived through the long period between that time and the appearance of John the Baptist. In him and in the greater prophet whose approach he heralded, this hope appears in an intense form: indeed, it seems to have passed into fulfilment when Jesus declared, "The Kingdom of God is among (within) you,"[65] and again, "Blessed are the eyes that see the things which ye see: for I say unto you that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear and heard them not,"[66] and yet again, "A greater than Solomon is here."[67] But if, from our point of view, the hope of the prophetic vision was here fulfilled, it was obviously fulfilled only in a germinal manner, fulfilled, perhaps we may say, in the personal consciousness of Jesus that God's rule in him was perfect. From this realized Kingdom of God in his own soul might flow, as we can easily believe, the

[65] Luke 17:21. [66] Luke 10:23-24. [67] Luke 11:31.

assurance that the vision of the prophets had at last become a reality on earth. Yet it is quite possible, yea, it is altogether probable, that no one of the prophets would have recognized in Jesus the fulfilment of his dream, or even the promise of that fulfilment. Indeed, the very disciples of Jesus, tho their lives were deeply affected by the force of his personality, did not see in him the fulfilment of the vision of their fathers. For this they looked to the future. They believed that it was bound up indissolubly with the person and work of their Master, but it was still hidden, and would come at last in a supernatural and overwhelming manner.

How deeply Jesus shared the current apocalyptic views of his people, that the Messiah would come upon the clouds of heaven with power and great glory and would supernaturally establish on earth the Kingdom of God, is a question on which scholars are not agreed.

From our point of view far down the Christian centuries it is obvious, first, that the loftier element of the various prophetic visions of an ideal future, the complete dominion of God in human life, was germinally realized in the inner life of Jesus; and, second, that the Jewish expectation of a spectacular cosmical end of the

present order and the inauguration of the new eternal order in the near future, even as the earlier expectation of a renewed Israel dwelling in a renewed Palestine and having dominion over all nations, has been providentially shown to have been a human error. The "near future" of that time has been buried beneath nearly a score of centuries, and to the abandonment of the *time* for the fulfilment of the apocalyptic expectation of the end has succeeded, in the Church as a whole, the abandonment of the expectation itself. We do not look for a coming of the Messiah on the clouds of heaven and a miraculous establishment of the Kingdom of God. But the abandonment of that Jewish belief does not affect the essential content of the prophetic vision of an ideal future; it is merely a matter of form and outward circumstance.

The prophetic vision of a Golden Age included, in the case of some of the writings, a universal and lasting peace, and that vision, we may hold, was germinally realized in Jesus. But his appearance and preaching created divisions in his own time, induced persecution, brought him to the cross, aroused intense feeling against his disciples, first on the part of the Jews and later on the part of the Gentiles, and for three

centuries fomented unrest throughout the Roman world.

All this conflict and division was, doubtless, quite foreign to the thought of the old prophets as they looked forward and pictured to themselves the ideal future age. This Christian fulfilment seemed, outwardly, no fulfilment at all. There had come a sword and not peace. The career of the Master, hedged about by opposition and terminated by the cross, was long to remain typical of his followers' career. It was the inner, not the outer, life of Jesus in which the vision of a new earth began to be realized. That knowledge of Yahweh which was to characterize the men of the ideal future he possest in unique fulness. Out of this knowledge sprang love, and love is the bringer of peace, not only within but also without. Jesus was the Prince of Peace simply because he was the renewer of life by the power of love. He did not command the Romans to lay down their arms, even as he did not encourage the Zealots to take up arms against their foreign rulers. One course was as far from his thought as the other. He created peace by breathing into men the spirit of brotherhood. If the prophets' hope of peace does not appear conspicuous in the preaching of Jesus, it

is because its light is lost in the greater light of love. It is there, inextricably bound up in the Master's message.

The greatest surprize the prophets would have experienced if they had seen Jesus and had been told that their vision of an ideal future, in all its wealth and comprehensiveness, was fulfilled in him, would have been that this fulfilment was only germinal. Instead of a great new order of history, complete from the start, or as complete as it was ever to be, they had only the living seed of the new order; instead of a new society, merely an individual with power to attach others to himself, in whom the finished social organism was latent; instead of the consummation of the ages, only the consummator working as a humble individual on other individuals. The old vision was fulfilled, yet *not* fulfilled. There was a new man, not yet a new nation, still less a new world. But in this new man was lodged the seed out of which was to come the fulfilment of the prophets' vision of peace universal because in him the ethical and religious ideal of the great prophets was realized, yea more than realized; in him was realized, with creative and unwasting power, the dominion of the love of God in human life.

Chapter IV

THE INFLUENCE OF THE BIBLE ON THE SENTIMENT AND THE INSTITUTIONS OF PEACE. 1. FROM THE SECOND CENTURY TO THE BEGINNING OF THE MODERN AGE

TO measure accurately the part which the Bible has had in the creation and development of the desire and purpose to substitute peace for war, and in the establishment of institutions whose aim is to realize that desire and purpose, would of course be an impossible task. The Bible has been the main source of religious direction and inspiration for all Christian peoples, and religion has always been, as it still is, the deepest spring of human progress. But the connection between the Bible and specific stages of progress is often indirect and hidden, the more so as the distance between the living present and the Bible widens. While countless deeds are daily wrought for righteousness by those who are perfectly conscious that their best life is rooted in the Gospel, it is also true that countless good influences are daily set in motion or fostered by men and women who are *not* aware that the

spirit of their lives is a heritage from the Bible, and indeed it is not, in multitudes of cases.

But tho it is impossible perfectly to disentangle the strands of the Bible's influence for peace from other influences working toward that end, we may, nevertheless, hope to form an approximately correct view of their strength, and even that task seems well worth the doing.

It is to be admitted, of course, at the outset that the Bible[1] has promoted war as well as peace, that it has furnished the quiver of the stout fighter not less abundantly than that of the friend of peace. We shall not attempt to show how widely and deeply the Bible has stimulated war either by its picture of a warlike Yahweh, or through various texts and incidents in Old Testament history, or through the misinterpretation of certain New Testament passages. The man who has had it in his heart and in the power of his hand to torment or kill his adversary has never been long at a loss to find justification in Scripture, if, indeed, he has sought it. As in the name of Liberty some of the worst crimes against her spirit have been perpetrated, so in the name of

[1] We do not say that "ecclesiastical influence" merely has promoted war, tho that is quite true, but we go further and say that the Bible also has done this.

God and the Bible men have often plunged wildly into the nethermost abysses of savage war.

And yet, while making this admission, we hold it true that the growth of the sentiment and institutions of peace—a growth that implies a corresponding decline of the war-spirit—is traceable in a considerable degree to the Bible, the same Bible that has sometimes fed the destroying flames of war, but that Bible better understood. While following, then, the stream of sweet water, we do not deny that a stream of bitter water has sprung from the same many-chambered fountain-head.

It may also be said at the outset of this discussion that, while we look back upon nineteen centuries of Christian history, we look back upon only four and a half in which the Bible has been widely read, and upon another period of about equal length in which, tho not widely read, the Bible was, nevertheless, widely known. But for a thousand years before the invention of printing the Bible had very little opportunity to mold the thoughts and purposes of men. It was poorly understood by the clergy as a rule, and comparatively unknown to the masses. The significance of this familiar fact for the subject in hand ought not to be overlooked. If the influence of

the Bible from the fifth century to the fifteenth was relatively slight, it must be remembered that the *knowledge* of the Bible also was relatively slight in those centuries. Even to-day the Bible is far from having its rights, but it is surely a hundredfold more widely read among Christians and vastly better understood than it was from the fall of Rome to the beginnings of the Modern Age. Yet the earlier centuries can not be passed over in any discussion of the influence of the Bible on the sentiment and the institutions of peace. They were barren, no doubt, but not altogether barren, and the fruit which they bore was a prophecy of wider and richer harvests.

We begin our survey with the second century, when Christian literature, as distinguished from the writings of the New Testament, had its beginning. We find that the Gospel made for peace in that century by creating an atmosphere of love in the light of its revelation of the character of God, and by its emphasis on spiritual values. Its influence on war was indirect, as that of Jesus had been. Its advocates had no political program, and, so far as we can see, had no deep and decided feeling in regard to war. From the Apologists of the second century we learn that the Christian life of that time was characterized, on

its civil and social side, by its cheerful obedience to the laws and its quick response to the needs of men. In the *Epistle to Diognetus*,[2] it is said of Christians that, as citizens, they share in all things with others; they obey the prescribed laws, they love all men, they do good. They are thought of as the very soul of the world,[3] but this "illustrious position" is assigned to them by God because of their general moral and spiritual excellence. Of the same purport are the words of Justin Martyr in his *Address* to Antoninus Pius with the senate and people of Rome, for, speaking of Christians, he says: "We, more readily than all other men, endeavor to pay to those appointed by you the taxes, both ordinary and extraordinary," and, again, he claims that they are patient of injuries, and ready to serve.[4] It is in view of this spirit in their daily lives that he boldly asserts, in behalf of Christians: "We, more than all others, are your helpers and allies in promoting peace."[5] Theophilus of Antioch and Athenagoras of Athens, writing in the time of Marcus Aurelius, claim that Christians are loyal and obedient to the government, and Theophilus sketches the Christian life with terms as

[2] See Chapter 5.
[3] Epistle to Diognetus, 6.
[4] *First Apology*, 16-17.
[5] *First Apology*, 12.

laudatory as those of the *Epistle to Diognetus*.[6] He says of his fellow-believers: "With them temperance dwells, self-restraint is practised, monogamy is observed, chastity is guarded, iniquity exterminated, sin eradicated, righteousness exercised, law administered, worship performed, God acknowledged. Truth governs, grace guards, peace screens them."

Thus we may say that, in the view of those second-century writers who treated of the relation of Christians to the world, they promoted peace by living lives of conspicuous moral excellence. They constituted a sort of informal and indirect peace society.

There is no evidence from the second century that Christians refused to enter the army when called upon by the government to do so. We know the charges that were brought against them —that they did not sacrifice to idols, that they were guilty of unlawful intercourse in their secret meetings, and that they killed and ate little children[7]—but it was not charged that they refused to fight for their country. Indeed, it is

[6] Theophilus to *Antolycus*, 3:15; Athenagoras, *Plea for Christians*, 3.

[7] Compare the analogous ritual-murder case of Mendel Beiliss which has been tried in Kieff this year (1913).

implied in all the writers whom we have quoted that Christians stood ready to bear their part in the army.[8] As far as we can learn, the question whether a Christian might be a soldier consistently with his Christian profession was not once raised in the second century. Of opposition to war on the ground that it is contrary to the revealed will of God, there is no trace whatsoever in this period.

When we come to the end of the second century and the beginning of the third, we hear a new note, first of all, in Tertullian, the brilliant writer of Carthage, in North Africa. In his *Apology* to the rulers of the Roman Empire, he explicitly confirms what we have seen to be implied in various writers who preceded him, for he says of Christians:[9] "We are but of yesterday, and we have filled every place among you, cities, islands, fortresses, towns, market-places, the very camp . . . palace, senate, forum." According to this language, Christians had entered the army, and were seen in high public offices in civil life. This statement is all the more noteworthy because Tertullian inti-

[8] See story of the Thundering Legion, Eusebius, *Church History*, 5:5, and story of Marinus, Eusebius, *Church History*, 7:15.

[9] *Apology*, 37.

mates, in the same connection, that he considered the soldier's life incompatible with the Christian profession. "For what wars should we not be fit," he asks, "not eager, even with unequal forces, we who so willingly yield ourselves to the sword, *if in our religion it were not counted better to be slain than to slay?*"

This is the first indication of religious protest against participation in war by Christians. Obviously, the protest was exceptional. We can not suppose that those believers who voluntarily "filled" the camps thought it "better to be slain than to slay." That is simply the writer's own individual view of the matter—a view, however, which he believed to be contained in his religion, that is, in the Bible. He does not appear to have held it at this time as perfectly clear and incontestable, as a view which was imperative for the Christian as such. For, speaking in behalf of the Christian community in general, he says to the Roman people, "We sail with you, and fight with you, and till the ground with you." This seems to imply that, for most Christians at least, if not for him, military service was on the same ethical level with the work of the sailor and the farmer. They entered all these callings without religious scruples.

The question had, indeed, been raised whether a "servant of God" might assume the "administration of any dignity or power,"[10] and the cases of Joseph and Daniel seem to have been cited by those who believed it right so to do. Tertullian was ready to admit that, if one *could* administer a public office without in any wise participating in idolatrous rites, it would be allowable, but he was strongly inclined to hold this impossible. However, he explicitly discriminated between military service, even that of the rank and file, and what he called "dignities and powers."[11] Regarding the former, his conclusion seems to have been very positive as early as the time when he wrote the treatise on Idolatry. There is no agreement, he says, between the divine and the human "sacrament," that is, the vow to God and the military oath. "How will a Christian man war, nay, how will he even serve in peace, without a sword, which the Lord has taken away? For, altho soldiers had come to John and had received instruction for their rule, altho, likewise, a centurion had believed, yet afterward the Lord, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier."

Thus Tertullian rested his case on a single say-

[10] Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, 17. [11] *On Idolatry*, 19.

ing of Jesus, namely the command to Peter, "Put up thy sword in its sheath; for they who take the sword shall perish by the sword."[12] It is to be noticed that he makes a difference between the standard of the Old Testament and that of the New. It is true, he says, that Moses carried a rod, as did the Roman captain, also that Joshua led a line of march, and the people warred, but it is only "sporting" with the subject to infer from these Old Testament incidents what a *Christian's* duty is.

In a writing of later date Tertullian again appeals to the word of Jesus to Peter as to a clear and absolute law.[13] Shall it be held right, he says, to make an occupation of the sword when the Lord proclaims that he who takes the sword shall perish by the sword? To this he adds another New Testament passage,[14] whose purport appears to him to be self-evident. "Shall the son of peace take part in the battle when it does not become him even to sue at law?" The Christian is a "son of peace." It is, therefore, improper for him to bring suit against another who may have wronged him. Hence, it must be in the highest degree improper for him to go to war

[12] Matt. 26:52. [13] *On the Soldier's Crown*, 11.
[14] 1 Cor. 6:1-7.

in defense of what seem to be his rights. Thus Tertullian came to hold, on New Testament grounds, that a Christian may not engage in war.

This formal protest against a Christian's participating in war recurs more or less frequently in a more or less elaborate form, in subsequent writers. The second great African writer, Origen of Alexandria, who belonged to the next generation after Tertullian, agrees with him that Christians should not be soldiers, but he does not appear to have been led to this conviction by any particular text of Scripture regarding war or peace. It resulted, rather, from his belief in the *priestly* character of Christians. Appealing to the practise of the Gentiles, he says that the priests who attended on certain gods kept their hands free from human blood; they were never enlisted in the army. If that was a laudable custom, says Origen, then surely it is also a praiseworthy thing that Christians, as the priests and ministers of God, should keep their hands pure, that they may pray to God in behalf of those who fight in a righteous cause, and for the king who reigns righteously.[15]

But while Origen argues that Christians should

[15] *Against Celsus*, 8:73.

be exempted from military duty, he does not declare against all war. On the contrary, he clearly believes that some wars are righteous, just as he holds that some kings rule righteously. It is obvious, however, that his view excludes war between two Christian peoples, for *all* Christians are priests, and all *priests* are, as such, exempt from military service.

It is highly significant and interesting to note the practical justification of Origen's view, in his own mind. It is that Christians, by their prayers, vanquish all demons, those beings who stir up war and lead to the violation of oaths. Therefore, Christians are much more helpful to kings than are those who go into the field to fight for them. They constitute a special army, an army of piety, and it would seem to be logically implied in Origen's view that "this army of piety," if unhindered by governments, and faithful to its mission, would do away with all war at length by its complete subjugations of the demons.

It was thus that Origen replied to Celsus, the notable opponent of Christianity, who called upon Christians to fight for the king. The summons of Celsus implies that, in his time, there was, at least, some positive opposition among Christians to participating in war, and Origen speaks as tho

this was general. He says, "We do not indeed fight under him" (*i.e.*, the king), and again, "Christians decline public offices that they may reserve themselves for a diviner and more necessary service."[16] It is impossible, however, to believe that Christians in general throughout the Roman Empire refused to perform military service at this time, for in that case Celsus would not have failed to make much of the refusal, whereas, to judge from Origen's reply to him, he made but little of it. Then, too, it was only a short time before Origen that Tertullian spoke as tho the participation of Christians in military service was altogether common, and, shortly after Origen's day, we hear the Emperor Diocletian advising Galerius to exclude Christians from the court and the army.[17] Such counsel implies a considerable Christian element in the Roman camps. A little later still, in the early years of the fourth century, Licinius, emperor of the eastern part of the now divided empire, removed from office those Christians who held military commands in his various cities,[18] unless they consented to perform the customary sacrifices. This language

[16] *Against Celsus*, 75.

[17] Lactantius, *Of the Manner in which Persecutors Died*, 11.

[18] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, 1:54.

suggests that, in the military force of the eastern empire, there were not a few Christians.

With the conversion (?) of Constantine,[19] and his accession, first to the supreme power in the West and then to the sovereignty of the entire empire, the symbols of the Christian religion came to new prominence in the Roman camp, and its confessors were promoted to high offices, both in the civil and the military sphere. Then, for the first time, the figure of the cross, which, in connection with Jesus, stood for utter self-sacrifice, and so for peace, made its official entrance on the stage of human warfare. The historian Sozomen (fifth century) tells us that Constantine, in order that his soldiers might learn to worship God as he did, had their weapons marked with the symbol of the cross.[20] He took with him, on his military campaigns, according to the same historian, a tent constructed in the shape of a Christian church, also priests and deacons, that the praise and worship of God might be celebrated even in the midst of war. Before his legions there was borne a costly standard in the

[19] His first edict favoring the Christian religion was proclaimed in 311; he was not baptized until shortly before his death in 337.

[20] *Ecclesiastical History*, 1:8.

form of a cross, on the top of which, in a golden wreath, stood the first two letters of the name of Christ.[21] This sacred standard (*Labarum*) was regarded by him as a most potent charm against all hostile powers, and, surrounded by fifty men distinguished for personal piety and strength of arm, it was borne where the fight was hottest, and always with salutary effects.[22]

It is obvious that the influence of Constantine was on the side of those who thought it right for Christians to engage in war. His church in the camp, with its ministering clergy, seemed to identify God and Christ with the war of the imperial government, as in olden time the presence of the Ark was supposed to insure the favor of Yahweh for the armies of Israel. The saying of Tertullian that in the Christian religion it is counted better to be slain than to slay would certainly not have been acknowledged by Constantine, or by the hosts of believers who followed the standard of the cross. It would have seemed to them as erratic and impossible as the utterances of Tolstoy seemed to his warlike contemporaries.

Yet, in the household of Constantine, in the capacity of a tutor, lived Lactantius, who held

[21] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, 1:31.

[22] *Life of Constantine*, 2. 7-8.

that all shedding of human blood is unlawful, that the only warfare for a just man is justice itself. Believing that it is homicide to slay with a word, as truly as it is to slay with a sword, Lactantius went even to the length of declaring that a just man will not bring a capital charge against his brother-man.[23] Lactantius at the court of Constantine was as much an anomaly as Tolstoy would have been at the court of the Czar Nicholas II.

There are certain ecclesiastical canons, published, we may suppose, in the fourth century, and not long after the reign of Constantine, which confirm the view that his influence gave a stimulus to the cultivation of the military profession by Christians. "Let a bishop or presbyter or deacon," we read, "who goes to the army, and desires to retain both the Roman Government and the sacerdotal administration, be deprived."[24] We infer from this legislation that it was no uncommon occurrence for a deacon or presbyter, or even for a bishop, to go to the army, and also that some of those who went were convinced that military service was in perfect accord with service in the Church. This was the point which

[23] *Divine Institutes*, 6:20.

[24] *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, 8:47:83.

the authors of the *Ecclesiastical Canons* opposed. They declare that a bishop who enters military service can not remain over a diocese, nor a presbyter or deacon carry his ecclesiastical office with him into war. The bishop is free to go into the army—this is taken for granted—but when he goes, he must relinquish his episcopal trust. So, also, with presbyters and deacons.

The ground of this legislation is not indicated. It may have been the practical consideration that the work of a church officer must, of necessity, be neglected while he is absent in the army, but it is more likely to have been a feeling that the two kinds of service, being so different in character, ought to be kept in separate hands. Perhaps both considerations had weight, and others, too, of which we have no knowledge.

The Council of Chalcedon, in 451, found it necessary to legislate again on this subject. No discrimination was made between military service and any other secular occupation. It was by no means condemned as wrong in itself. What the Council condemned was that men who had once been enrolled among the clergy should then enter military service.[25] Monks, also, were included in this prohibition.

[25] *Canons of Chalcedon*, 7.

Whatever the dominant motive in this legislation may have been, we know that there were Christians in those times who not only held the military career to be less sacred and less important than service in the Church, but who also regarded it as inconsistent with the Christian profession. Such an one was Martin of Tours (319–400). After several years of service in the army, two of which followed his baptism, he at length withdrew, declaring that, as a soldier of Christ, it was not lawful for him to be a soldier of Cæsar.[26] But such cases were probably exceptional, as Martin's entire career, seen through the eyes of his enthusiastic biographer, was altogether unique. The current view of Christians is to be seen rather in a letter of Theodoret,[27] Bishop of Cyrus, in eastern Syria, in the fifth century. The letter is addrest to soldiers, and, remarkable to relate, to soldiers who had requested the bishop to write to them on the theological and philosophical question whether all things are possible to God. He begins his letter by saying that "human nature is everywhere the same, but pursuits in life are many and various. Some men prefer a sailor's career, some a soldier's; some

[26] Sulpitius Severus, *Life of St. Martin of Tours*, 4.
[27] Theodoret, *Letters*, 144.

men become athletes, some husbandmen; some ply one craft, and some another." From these differences, *which are not counted important,* the bishop goes on to say that "some men are zealous and diligent about divine things, and get themselves instructed in the exact teaching of the apostolical doctors"—just what the soldiers had done in writing to him—"while others suppose that the enjoyment of base pleasures is happiness."

Notice that the bishop regarded it merely as a matter of personal preference whether a man became a sailor or a soldier. And let the words with which his letter concludes be considered. He exhorts the soldiers to keep inviolate the teaching of the Gospels, that in the day of Christ's appearance they may bring to the righteous Judge what has been entrusted to them, with its due interest, and may hear the longed-for words, "Well done! good and faithful servant."

Obviously, it was possible in his thought to be a soldier and yet to keep the teaching of the Gospels inviolate. This possibility had already been realized once, at least, for, in a letter of Basil the Great[28] (died 379) to a soldier, we read these words: "I have learned to know one who proves that even in a soldier's life it is possible

[28] Basil, *Letters,* 106.

to preserve the perfection of love to God." We are constrained, however, in the interest of truth, to put by the side of this remarkable letter another word of Basil's, which surely qualifies it in some degree. "I think it advisable," he says, "for such as have been guilty of killing a man in war to forbear communion three years."[29] Thus he seems to have regarded it as practically certain that soldiers who had been in battle and had slain their enemies would not have preserved "the perfection of the love of God." He would, therefore, withhold from them the highest privilege of religion.

With Theodoret of the East we may associate, in this connection, the greatest of the fifth century writers of the West, Augustine of Hippo, in North Africa (354-430). His later years witnessed the Gothic invasion of Italy, with the sack of Rome, and the Vandal invasion of North Africa, yet, tho living in the midst of the horrors of war, he did not agree with Tertullian that the Christian regards it as better to be slain than to slay. On the contrary, he held that God sometimes commands war "to rebuke or humble or crush the pride of man,"[30] and he found, or thought he found, clear New Testament justifica-

[29] *Canons of Basil*, 13. [30] *Reply to Faustus*, 22:75.

tion of his position. He appealed to John the Baptist, who, when soldiers came to him asking what they should do, did not tell them to throw away their arms and give up military service. He cited, also, the case of the centurion, whose faith Jesus praised, but whom he did not command to resign his office. When Jesus declared that men should render to Cæsar the things of Cæsar, he thereby recognized military service as lawful. We do not here inquire into the validity of Augustine's Biblical argument, but simply note that he regarded the argument as conclusive. He stood with the great majority of leaders of earlier generations in defending war on Biblical grounds.

We have met with nothing thus far in Christian history which has pointed to a lessening of war or an amelioration of war's sufferings as a direct result of the influence of the Bible. The language of Athanasius seems to be a pleasant dream rather than a reflection of history. "When the barbarians," says this famous bishop of Alexandria, "hear the teaching of Christ, straightway, instead of fighting, they turn to husbandry, and, instead of arming their hands with weapons, they raise them in prayer, and, in a word, in place of fighting among themselves, henceforth

they arm against the devil and against evil spirits, subduing these by self-restraint and virtue of soul."[31] No doubt there were individual cases of such transformation among the barbarians, as among the Greeks and Romans, but the writer fails to give any instance of the eradication of the warlike spirit in an entire nation or tribe of barbarians. In the century before his own, and in his own time also, the Gothic barbarians, tho they had heard the teaching of Christ and accepted it, instead of arming against the devil and evil spirits, invaded Thrace with fire and sword, just as the heathen Huns did a little later. Augustine says, indeed, that in the sack of Rome, the barbarians, contrary to the custom of war,[32] spared, for Christ's sake, those who took refuge in the churches.[33] It would be gratifying if we could feel sure that even this slight amelioration of the six days' orgy of pillage and rapine was caused by regard for the name of Christ. But we see no clear traces of Christian mercy in the conquerors, either here or in the Vandal invasion

[31] *The Incarnation of the Word,* 52:2.

[32] But three years before the sack of Rome, Teutonic barbarians who had *not* heard the teaching of Christ spared the conquered Celts in Britain.

[33] *City of God,* 1:1-2.

of North Africa, tho these Vandals were counted as fruits of the Christian mission.

Not only do we find no lessening of war, and no amelioration of war's horrors, in the early centuries, among those peoples who had accepted the new religion, but we have a sickening record of bloodshed that was due to the theological differences of those who bore the Christian name. Between the third and the fifth centuries there were many outbreaks and riots in Constantinople, Alexandria, and other cities, especially in the East, which, tho not assuming the proportions, nor marked by the formal declaration of war, shared its ferocious and bloody character.[34] And yet the leaven of the Gospel of peace and love was slowly working in those centuries. Individuals like Tertullian, Origen and Lactantius lifted their voices against participation in war by Christians, and even against all shedding of human blood, and church councils used their power to keep the clergy out of military service. At the same time the spirit of Christian brotherhood was developing here and there, building a hospital near Cæsarea in which even lepers were received,[35] and other

[34] See *e.g.*, Sozomen, *Eccles. History*, 8:1; 8:8; Theodoret, *Eccles. History*, 4:19.

[35] Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration on Basil*, 63.

hospitals in Constantinople and Egypt and Rome before the end of the fourth century, ameliorating the condition of slaves and even allowing them to be ordained with the consent of their owners,[36] ministering to the poor of the Church even in distant lands, thus creating some sense of unity among those widely separated,[37] and abolishing the gladiatorial combats whereby the hearts of men had long been hardened to the spectacle of human suffering.[38]

With Gregory the Great (590-604) we enter a new epoch in the development of our subject. Now for the first time we see the Church, through its most distinguished and powerful representative, taking an active part in the movement of troops and the making of treaties. Gregory sent soldiers against Ariulph the Lombard king, and gave orders to Mauritius and Vitalianus to harass the enemy's rear.[39] Gregory's letter to Zabardas, duke of Sardinia, throws interesting light both on his spirit and on the question of his personal influ-

[36] *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, 2:62; 8:33; *Eccles. Canons*, 82.

[37] See *e.g.*, Basil, *Letters*, 70; Eusebius, *Church Hist.*, 5:23; *Canons of Gangra, Epilog.*

[38] Theodoret, *Eccles. Hist.*, 5:26. Constantine began, Honorius completed this reform.

[39] *Epistles*, 2:29.

ence. "We give great thanks to Almighty God," he says, "that Sardinia has such a duke, one who knows how to do his duty to the republic in earthly matters so as also to exhibit to Almighty God dutiful regard for the heavenly country. For they have written to me that you are arranging terms of peace with the Barbaricini on such conditions as to bring these same Barbaricini to the service of Christ."[40]

Gregory takes it for granted that there are righteous wars, and tells the emperor that the Church prays for him, that his victories may be extended in all nations.[41] It is by the way of prayer that the emperor is to be invincible. Were the priests faithful, were the emperor submissive to the heavenly loving-kindness, then he would tread all enemies under the foot of his valor.[42] It was because of the vital part which prayer was supposed by Gregory to play in war that he protested against a law which forbade soldiers to become monks.[43] The more the "army of God" increases, says this stout defender of the monastic life, the more will the armies of the empire increase, that is, through the efficacy of their prayers. He indignantly rejects the sus-

[40] *Epistles*, 4:24.
[41] *Epistles*, 5:30.
[42] *Epistles*, 5:20; 7:6.
[43] *Epistles* 3:65, 66.

picion that whenever a soldier turned monk it was from an unworthy motive, and declares that he has known soldier-monks who have wrought miracles. When Gregory says that the faults of the Church sharpen the swords of the enemy, we must not suppose his meaning to be that a holy Church would *have* no enemies, that its purity and love would make all men its friends. He meant, rather, that such a church could count on the help of the irresistible power of God. It is the Old Testament conception of a chosen people enjoying supernatural protection in its wars.

From Gregory the Great to Charlemagne, who was crowned emperor by the Pope on Christmas of the year 800, an influence of the Bible can, indeed be traced, but it is indirect and inconspicuous. War was more constant and more universal in this period than it had been in the two preceding centuries, nor was it less fierce. It was but a little distance and for a short time that "a woman with her babe might walk scatheless in Eadwine's day," and even this golden interval of peace in northern England was secured before Eadwine's conversion to Christianity. Luitprand, King of the Lombards, was moved by the words of Gregory II. to lay aside his warlike accouter-

ments and to consecrate them as votive offerings at the tomb of St. Peter, but his nature was unchanged, and he soon found other weapons and new occasions to employ them. Throughout the territory of the old Roman Empire, the kingdoms and tribes of men, whether Christian or not, whether their standards, like that of Oswald, bore the cross or some pagan symbol, settled, or attempted to settle, all disputes by an appeal to arms, and causes of dispute were seldom lacking to any people. Charlemagne was saluted at his coronation as the "Pacific Emperor,"[44] yet he is credited with fifty-three campaigns, and his method of pacifying the surrounding tribes does not appear to have been more merciful than that of Julius Cæsar or Augustus.

But tho war was almost constant and universal in those centuries, there were forces at work which, however slowly and indirectly, made for peace; and these forces, or at least the most conspicuous of them, had their origin in the Bible. There was the monastery, and especially the monastic school. Already in the fifth century this institution is found, as in the Island of St. Lérins near Marseilles, where Hilary and other notable men were trained, and in the sixth century the

[44] Text in Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2. 1:42.

famous monastery of Vivarium was founded by Cassiodorus, who laid great stress on the educational side of the monastic life. For the period of the seventh and eighth centuries the monastic schools at Fulda in Germany and Jarrow in Northumbria show us the institution at its best. If Bæda through his six hundred scholars was, as Green calls him, "the father of our national education," so Rabanus Maurus, who founded the school at the monastery in Fulda, became the first teacher of Germany. In the monastic schools of these centuries the Bible, as interpreted by the Fathers, was the chief subject of study, and its principles helped to mold the minds of some men who became leaders in Church and State. Nor should we fail to note that from the monastic copyists went forth whatever copies of the Bible or parts of the Bible were to be found in the homes of the clergy and of others who had the means and the inclination to possess them.

We must also count the monks themselves, notwithstanding the grievous charges that may be brought against some of them in every age of the Church, as an important, tho indirect, Biblical contribution to the cause of peace. For all through the Middle Ages these men who, in the aggregate, must have numbered several millions, were not

only withdrawn from war, thereby lessening the military strength of the various peoples, but they wrought in manifold ways for the betterment of the economic conditions of their time. It was a hopeful circumstance that in every rude and warlike generation, from Benedict of Nursia, who died in 543, onward through the Middle Ages, there were little companies of men scattered over Europe who, in the name of the Christian religion, dug ditches, drained marshes, tilled the soil, and built schools and churches instead of entering the profession of arms.

There is another fact which came into prominence in the seventh and eighth centuries, that is of much significance for the discussion of the Bible's influence on the sentiment and institutions of peace. This is the unifying power of the Church. There was truth as well as boasting in the words of Gregory II. (715-731) to Leo III.: "Are you ignorant," he said, "that the popes are the bond of union, the mediators of peace between the East and the West? The nations revere the Apostle Peter as a god upon earth."[45] The pope, especially from the time of Gregory I., was indeed a "bond of union," not only between the East and the West, but also between the various

[45] Gibbon, 5:18.

sections of the West.[46] The traditional glory of the Roman Bishopric which borrowed much from the glory of the Eternal City itself, the great wealth which it possest as early as Gregory the Great, and the illustrious services of this pope who, Gibbon says, might justly be styled the Father of his country, all contributed to give to the occupant of this high office a unique unifying power. This unifying power of the Church, like that of steam and electricity in our own age—to illustrate the spiritual by the material—promoted peace rather than war in the seventh and eighth centuries, as also in some later ages. Thus, the discordant political elements in England at this time were solidified chiefly through the influence of the Church, and the German tribes were brought into a closer relation to each other by the mission of Boniface, who secured their conversion and their allegiance to the head of the Church in Rome. The recognition of the papal office, Alcuin's *apostolica sublimitas,* as supreme over all the churches, was the beginning of an international consciousness, weak and vague, no doubt—for no people was then half-civilized or half-Christianized—but still a step toward a far-off international brotherhood.

[46] The Church of Ireland affords the most notable exception to this principle in the Middle Ages.

From Charlemagne to the beginnings of the Modern Age was, in round numbers, seven centuries. Savonarola's dream of 1492, in which he saw swords, arrows, and flames raining upon the earth, might have been dreamed in any generation of all that vast period, and Dante's complaint, that since the time of Augustus the nations had unceasingly raged against each other, was even more true of the two centuries following his time than it was of the second and third centuries after Augustus. One new and significant feature meets us in the wars of this period and that is the active participation of the Christian Church through its supreme head. As might be expected, the wars in which the Pope took the initiative were largely religious. This motive was dominant in the wars with the Mohammedans, first suggested by Sylvester II., organized by Urban II. (1095), and a prominent feature of papal policy for four hundred years. The solemn vow of Calixtus III. to "deliver the Christians languishing in slavery, to exalt the true faith and to extirpate the diabolical sect of the reprobate and faithless Mahomet in the East,"[47] expresses the sentiment of many popes from Urban II. to Clement VII. The religious motive was domi-

[47] Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 2: 346.

nant also in the crusades against the Albigenses in France (1209-1229), and the Paterines of Bosnia (1447).

But the Church, through its head in Rome, waged also many wars which were primarily of a political character, as that of Urban VI. against Joanna of Naples (1381), that of Paul II. against Count Everso (1465), that of Innocent VIII. against the King of Naples, and that of Julius II. against Giovanni Bentivoglio (1506), while at the same time the pope, acting from political motives, powerfully promoted or hindered the warlike policies of different European states.

This new feature of the period under consideration shows how far the Church had traveled from the views of Tertullian. Instead of condemning war as essentially unchristian, the Church carried on war century after century, and sometimes the head of the Church took the field in person, as did Pius II. against the Turks (1464), and Paul II. against the rulers of Anguillara (1465). And, curious to note, in both cases appeal was made to words of Jesus, yea to one and the same word. For it will be remembered that, according to Tertullian, Jesus "unbelted" every soldier when he told Peter to put

up his sword in its place, but this very sword which Peter wielded to the discomfiture of the High Priest's servant (Matt. 26:51-52), was one of the "two swords"[48] which, according to Innocent III.,[49] belonged to the successors of Peter, that is, of course, to be *wielded* by them, the temporal sword and the spiritual, the former subordinate to the latter. Thus, at different times, the saying of Jesus to Peter has been held to prohibit all war, and also to authorize the supposed successors of Peter to wage war.

Thus the background on which we are to trace the Bible's influence on the sentiment of peace is, for the centuries between Charlemagne and the Modern Age, darker than that of the earlier times, inasmuch as we now see the Church itself, through its supreme representative, active in earthly warfare, not merely in the minor campaigns of the Italian States, but in the general European campaigns against the Mohammedans. We say darker, for, leaving at one side the question whether the Gospel *ever* tolerates war, it must be regarded as indisputable that the religion of Jesus is fundamentally opposed to those qualities which provoke and perpetuate strife. Therefore, it can not be denied that a peculiar dark-

[48] Luke 22:38. [49] See the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, 1299.

ness rests upon those times in which we see the Christian Church as an organization participating in war.

We have before us now seven centuries in which the sound of fighting rarely ceased, and in which the Black Death of 1348, which is said to have swept off nearly one-half of the population of Europe, appears only as the elder brother of War. Yet even in these ages, we can trace an influence of the Bible that made, more or less directly and powerfully, for the promotion of peace on earth.

In the first place, the Church was the strongest friend of education,[50] and education is one of the paths toward peace. The school at Bec in Normandy drew pupils from all European lands in the eleventh century, and its heads were the counsellors of kings. At the great universities of Paris, Oxford, and Bologna, founded in the thirteenth century, thousands of young men from different lands were brought together by an awakening desire for knowledge, they followed the same studies under the same professors, and used a common language. What we consciously seek

[50] Christians were not the *only* promoters of education. The Arabs of Spain led all European nations in the ninth and tenth centuries.

to promote by exchange-professorships and international scholarships, namely, a better international understanding and feeling, was unconsciously promoted in those earlier centuries by the intermingling of students from different lands at the universities, and likewise of professors. The Bible, if less prominent in the *curricula* of the universities than it had been in the earlier monastic schools, was still the chief subject of study for those who chose service in the Church. We get a vivid impression of this fact from the record of a gift to the library of the University of Paris in the year 1271. This gift was regarded as an important donation. We read that it consisted of *twenty-four* volumes. Of these, one was a scholastic history, one the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, and *twenty-two* were copies of the whole or parts of the Bible.[51]

Again, the peace that the first great English king made with Guthrum in 878 was made, on Alfred's part, with some thought of the mercy of God. When he had his enemy in his power, he took pity on him; and, before they separated, he and his nobles gave to him "many fine houses." It would appear from Asser's *Annals* that

[51] *Original Sources of European History* (Univ. of Penn.), Vol. 2, No. 3.

one condition of the peace with Guthrum was that he should become a Christian, and we to-day have little respect for those who attempt to force religion upon any one, but the significant point is that Alfred was led by his religion to make a treaty of peace with a conquered enemy.

We are probably to ascribe the peaceful policy of Canute (1016-1035), in a considerable measure, to the influence of the Pope and to his long visit in Rome as a pilgrim to the Christian shrines. We read in his Charter these remarkable words: "I took to my remembrance the writing and the word that Archbishop Lyfing brought me from Rome from the Pope, that I should everywhere maintain the glory of God, and put down wrong, and work full peace by the might that God would give me." In his Letter to his people after his visit in Rome, he says that he is going to Denmark to "conclude a treaty for a solid peace" with the surrounding nations.

Such incidents as these from the life of Alfred and Canute were not numerous and, in the period before us, they may have been unparalleled, but they are sufficient to show that the Bible, through the ministry of the Church, was an active and potent force in the political world, making for peace.

We pass on to an event of another order. The bishops of Burgundy made a decree in 1016 binding themselves and all men of their dioceses, under oath, to keep peace and justice.[52] Let it be noted that these Christian officials bound *themselves* to keep the peace—a plain indication that they had been more or less involved in the private feuds and local conflicts that prevailed far and wide. Some years later, in 1031, the bishops of Aquitania followed the example set by the Burgundians. This Church action for peace can not have met with distinguished success, for as early as 1041 the bishops of Aquitania, *"divine grace inspiring,"* decreed that during a certain specified part of each week, that is, from Wednesday evening till Monday morning, no man should do violence to another, no one should demand from an enemy the payment of a penalty, nor even receive the testimony of a witness.[53] This decree is said to have been firmly established throughout France. It was accepted by William of Normandy (1042), afterward conqueror of England. It was favored by Henry III. of Germany (1039-1056), and was straitly decreed by Henry IV. (1085). That its authors did not

[52] The text is given in Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, 2.1. 345.
[53] Gieseler, 2.1. 346.

anticipate for it a ready acceptance in all quarters is clear from the attractive promises and fiery threatenings that accompanied it. "Whoever," we read, "shall observe and firmly hold this peace of God are absolved by God the Father omnipotent, and his Son Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, by Mary with the choirs of virgins and by Michael with the choirs of angels and by Saint Peter with all the saints. But whoever shall knowingly violate this peace, once promised, are excommunicated by God the Father . . . accurst and abhorred, now and forever, and are damned as was Dathan and Abiram, and as Judas who betrayed the Lord, and are sunk in the depth of hell as Pharaoh was sunk in the midst of the sea, unless they amend their ways."[54]

This *God's Peace* was a Christian protest, *not* against war, as is often wrongly said, but against lawlessness and violence in private life, and in the relation of petty rulers to each other. Yet we may properly call it an institution of peace, an early forerunner of our international Conferences at The Hague. It did not have a long life, nor did it lead on to something better. It seems to have been lost in the mighty upheaval of the Crusades. To a degree it was rendered unneces-

[54] Gieseler, 2.1. 346.

sary by this movement against the Mohammedans of the Holy Land, for this greater war not only supplied the excitement and adventure which men craved, but it also brought them together and obliterated their lesser animosities more effectually than had been done by the decree of the bishops.

The Crusades show us the Church as an agent of war and not of peace. While they lasted they eclipsed all the influence of the Church for the promotion of peaceful relations between the nations, and we must admit the truth of Lecky's statement that "the clergy as a body have never opposed a war or sought to repress the military spirit with an energy at all comparable to that displayed in stimulating the Crusades."[55] This movement, however, is a monument to the power of religious fanaticism and superstition. It was a crime against the spirit of Christianity, and so against the Bible at its highest. It was only by a base and ignorant perversion of the Bible that it was made to feed the flame of crusading zeal.

In this connection, a word may fittingly be said of the papal efforts for peace in Europe during the fifteenth century. Such efforts were conspicuous, and not without a measure of success. In

[55] *History of European Morals*, 2:254.

November, 1453, a Peace Conference was held in Rome, called by Nicholas V., to bring the Italian States into harmonious relations to each other. This peace, however, was not sought for its own sake, but only in the interest of the war against the Turks.[56] The Bull of Paul II. in 1468, proclaiming peace in the chief Italian States, was caused by the Turkish peril, as was the proclamation of Sixtus IV. to the States of the Church. Innocent VIII. intervened between Corvinus and the German emperor (1484), in order that Corvinus might fight the infidels; and Leo X., in the spring of 1518, sought to establish a five-years' truce among all the European princes in the interest of a general crusade in Palestine. In these and other instances, the popes used their influence, sometimes with success and sometimes without, to secure peace among the warring factions of Italy or on the broader stage of Europe, but the peace which was sought at home was necessary to the waging of war abroad. The ultimate end in view was not peace but war, and, therefore, we can hardly regard these papal efforts for peace as anything more or better than the dictates of an essentially intolerant policy.

We turn to an influence of a higher and purer

[56] Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 2.25.

sort. In Catherine of Siena we have an advocate of peace who was moved by considerations wholly religious and Biblical. To Gregory XI. (1370-1378) she wrote, alluding to his enemies: "You must strike them with the weapons of goodness, of love, and of peace, and you will gain more than by the weapons of war. And when I inquire of God what is best for your salvation, for the restoration of the Church and for the whole world, there is no other answer but the word, Peace, Peace." And again, in a letter to one of the opposite party in the strife, she wrote: "What is sweeter than peace? It was the last will and testament which Jesus Christ left to his disciples, when he said: You shall not be known as my disciples by working miracles, nor by foretelling the future, nor by great holiness shown forth in all your actions, but only if you shall live together in charity and peace and love." In these words of the nun of Siena we have the utterance of a spirit as intensely in love with peace as was Tertullian eleven centuries earlier, and this utterance is, perhaps, the most forcible that is to be found on the pages of history from the second century to the fourteenth.

Contemporary with Catherine in Italy was the monk of Lutterworth in England, who made a

unique contribution to the Bible's influence on the peace sentiment in that he translated the Scriptures into one of the tongues of modern Europe.[57] The invention of Gutenberg was still in the distant future, and Wyclif's Bible could not make the same wide appeal that was made by Luther's a century and a half later, but, nevertheless, through the ardor of Wyclif's many followers it gained a currency in England such as it had never known before in any land.[58] We may well believe that there was an intimate connection between the opening of the Bible and the *Conclusion* presented to the king and parliament by the Wyclifites in 1394. This document affirms that manslaughter in war, without spiritual revelation, is expressly contrary to the New Testament, which is, indeed, a law of grace and full of mercy.

Thus, after nearly fourteen centuries from the time of Jesus, the first articulate appeal for the abolition of war was addrest to the rulers of a

[57] Parts of the Bible had been translated into French two centuries before Wyclif, and into German still earlier, but these translations seem to have had little influence. Reading of the Bible by the laity was forbidden by the Council of Toulouse in 1229.

[58] The seventh *Ordinance* of 1408 declared that it was heresy to be punished with fire to translate any part of the Bible into another tongue. This legislation, of course, implies that Wyclif's work had been widely influential.

nation. This appeal was based on the grace and mercy of the Gospel. It was made by a sect that was soon to be persecuted with utmost rigor, and it was made in vain. The day was still centuries remote when there was to be in any Christian nation even a respectable minority ready to endorse the Lollard *Conclusion* of 1394. But when at length the day dawns in which the grace and mercy of the Gospel permeate all human society, then will men, filled with admiration for the brave and clear Christian thinking of the Lollards, confess that this *Conclusion,* unheeded by king and parliament, was one of the great prophetic way-marks in the history of civilization.

CHAPTER V

THE INFLUENCE OF THE BIBLE ON THE SENTIMENT AND THE INSTITUTIONS OF PEACE: 2. IN THE MODERN AGE

THE background against which we trace the Bible's influence for peace does not change suddenly as we enter on the Modern Age, nor does it show any startling transformation during the four centuries between the day when Luther affixed his ninety-five theses to the door of the castle church in Wittenberg and this year of grace 1914.

In Sir Thomas More's *Utopia,* written at the beginning of this period, tho in certain social and economic features it was centuries ahead of its time, we read that the cities of the wondrous island in the West were still "compassed with a high and thick wall, in which there are many towers and forts; there is also a broad and deep dry ditch, set thick with thorns, cast round each town." Evidently, More did not foresee a day in which "the war-drum throbs no longer." His ideal republic is, indeed, free from *domestic* strife, but he anticipates wars between it and foreign nations.

Yet tho *Utopia* is not to be a stranger to bloody international conflicts, its people are not to employ mercenaries, and when they obtain a victory, they are to kill as few of the enemy as possible.

So ran the dream of one of the gentlest of men at the beginning of the sixteenth century, a man who said that he would gladly be put in a sack and cast into the Thames on condition that Christian princes should be at peace. He conceived of a state without internal wars and one which in its foreign wars should have a merciful regard for the lives of its enemies, but he did not dream of a time when all war should be abolished. Perhaps he did not dare to think of such a thing as possible, or if he did, it may have seemed altogether too remote to be of interest to his readers.

But even that modification of the evils of war which More foresaw, has not yet been realized. In the four hundred years that have passed since he dreamed of Utopia, domestic wars, which he eliminated from his ideal State, have raged in the various countries of Europe—wars as pitiless and desolating as any in the earlier centuries. With the growth of strong governments, private warfare, against which the Church began to

erect barriers in the eleventh century, has ceased. This end was gained before the Modern Age began. But this change was in the units of warfare rather than in the attitude of men toward war itself. Whatever ameliorating circumstances may be discovered in the war-record of the last four centuries, as, for example, the abandonment of resort to mercenaries, and, quite recently, the recognition of the rights of neutrals, it remains true that even during this period of the Modern Age one who follows the stream of the Bible's influence on the sentiment and the institutions of peace is seldom out of sight of smoking battlefields. And war is still war, clothed in all the old fury and ferocity of the early times, tho, when the storm is past, the ministry of the Red Cross does something to lighten the darkness of the place of slaughter. Did Charlemagne back in the eighth century behead his Saxon prisoners by the thousand? The Puritan Protector was no less fierce at Drogheda and Wexford in the middle of the seventeenth century. Was the war against the Albigenses in the thirteenth century such as to bring eternal shame to the Church? The religious wars of the seventeenth century were full of the same spirit. Did the Crusades, from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, sweep

off vast multitudes in the unending conflict with the infidel? The wars of Napoleon only a century ago probably destroyed more lives within a score of years than the Crusades in two centuries. Was the battle of Flodden Field, in which some seventeen thousand men were slain, fought to satisfy the "blazing zeal of romantic chivalry" in James IV? Battles as destructive of human life have just been fought in 1913 by the Balkan States for reasons even more ignoble.

But while the war-record of the Modern Age preserves even to the present day the essential characteristics of that record for the Medieval Age, there are signs that this record is to be changed and reduced in compass, if not closed altogether, and of these signs some have obviously come into being under the influence of the Bible. This, indeed, has not been alone in its working. The sages and poets of the classic world, the growth of Democracy which, tho owing much to the Bible, does not owe all to it, the material inventions and discoveries that have brought all nations into close contact, and, finally, the recognition both of the economic waste of war and of its impotency to afford a moral and equitable settlement of disputes, have all coöperated in producing that sentiment and those institutions of

peace which give to the present its most unique claim on the interest of the student of history and on the optimism of the friend of man. But our concern is simply with the part which the Bible has had in this beneficent movement.

We may here conveniently divide our sources of information into two groups—the literary and the institutional—for with the passing of the Modern Age the stream that we have been following increases rapidly in volume.

The first of these groups of sources—first in time and, doubtless, in influence also—is dominated by the treatise of Hugo Grotius, a Hollander of Delft, on *The Law of War and Peace* (1625), which, in the judgment of Andrew D. White, "of all books ever written, not claiming divine inspiration, has been of most benefit to mankind,"[1] and in view of which James Brown Scott speaks of Grotius as the "founder of international law and the instigator, if not the initiator of the (Hague) Conference."[2] The lofty place assigned to the work of Grotius makes it of especial interest and importance to inquire what influence the Bible exercised upon it.

The general answer to this question is quite

[1] *Autobiography*, 2: 274.

[2] See *The Hague Peace Conferences*, 1: 185.

obvious to one who reads Grotius' book. As Alfred, seven hundred years before Grotius, made the Ten Commandments a fundamental part of English law, so Grotius based his work on *The Law of War and Peace* directly and broadly upon the Bible. It was to this source that he looked for the justification of war itself, and from this, namely, from the Gospel, he deduced important modifications of ancient warfare, for example, the denial of the right of reprisal and vengeance.[3] Grotius regarded the New Testament as the ultimate source of Christian laws regarding war and peace, while at the same time he did not regard it as rendering the Old Testament obsolete.

Grotius was one of the most eminent and sane Biblical scholars of his century, but that century was the seventeenth. His method of interpretation has been to a considerable extent superseded. His argument from the New Testament in support of the rightfulness of war may be challenged at every point, but what may not be successfully challenged is this assertion, that the "founder of international law," the man of whose work the Hague Conference may be regarded as a natural result, was fundamentally influenced by the Bible

[3] See II 20.3.6; 20.8.3 and 6; 20.10.2.

in his treatise on *The Law of War and Peace*.[4] The magnificent wreath of silver and gold which was laid on his tomb, July 4, 1899, as a gift of our Government, was a tribute not simply to Grotius but to the Bible, the chief source and inspiration of his work.

The influence of the Bible on the work of Grotius was, however, not typical of its influence on the wide and still expanding literature of the subject. That influence has, indeed, been marked, yet we should not fail to recognize its limitations. The *Grand Design* of Henry IV. of France (1603) was inspired by hostility toward Austria, not by the Bible. Emeric Crucé, who is regarded as the father of the idea of International Arbitration, found the great motives to peace not in religion but in reason and humane feeling, and the best fruit of international peace was, in his estimation, not the promotion of the higher life of the individual and the State, but simply commerce.[5] Immanuel Kant in his *Essay on Perpetual Peace* (1795) makes no use either of Biblical teaching or of religion. The Emperor of Russia in his Rescript to the various governments

[4] See Darby, *International Tribunals*, pp. 10-15.

[5] For the text of Crucé's scheme see Darby, *International Tribunals*, p. 24.

represented at the Court of St. Petersburg in August, 1898, proposed a Conference in the interest of peace, but the sole exprest aim of this Conference was economic.

Furthermore, there have been eminent advocates of peace who were not of the disciples of Jesus, as, for example, Jean de Bloch, whose work on *The Future of War* has been called "the most powerful arraignment of war and the most powerful argument for the peace of the world which has been written in our time."[6]

Yet again there are books on peace by people who, tho they revere the Bible, make no use of its motives. To this class belongs the celebrated book by Baroness von Suttner, *Lay Down Your Arms,* which is inspired not by the Gospel, or by any religious motives, but by the desolating effects of war. It keenly satirizes the Biblical defense of war made by representatives of the Church, but does not itself employ the Christian revelation as a factor in the powerful argument which it evolves.

It is hardly necessary to say that the absence of this factor by no means implies either that the author is not in sympathy with the Christian

[6] Edwin D. Mead in the *Introduction* to an American edition of Bloch's work.

revelation, or that she does not regard it as fundamentally opposed to war. She simply does not employ it here. There are more avenues leading toward the world's peace than those which are religious, and it is obvious that the same person may approach it now along one of these and now along another. Tennyson regarded war as opposed to the spirit of Christianity, as we see when he makes the reign of the "Christ who is to be" dependent on the passing of the "thousand wars of old," but the lines of *Locksley Hall* which have stimulated the peace sentiment of English-speaking peoples for three-quarters of a century, do not require the Gospel for their explanation.

But let us follow now for a little the course of those writings which, like the work of Grotius, bear upon them a clear impress of Biblical thought. In William Penn's *Essay on the Peace of Europe* (1693) there are enumerated certain "real benefits" that would flow from the adoption of the proposed plan. Of these benefits the first two are distinctly religious. The shedding of human and Christian blood, says the author, is offensive to God, and again "the reputation of Christianity will, in some degree, be recovered in the sight of the infidels, which by the many bloody and unjust wars of Christians, hath been greatly impaired."

In the elaboration of this second benefit, Penn declares that peace is the nature, the office, the work, and the end of Christ. The only holy war is against the devil and not against the person of men.

Of the nineteenth century, the most influential writing on peace was probably the tract of Noah Worcester, entitled *A Solemn Review of the Custom of War,* which was published on Christmas, 1814. This date was suitable, for the inspiration of the writing is from the Gospel of peace. "If," says the author, "the temper of our Savior should universally prevail, wars must cease." This assertion is nowhere argued, but is thrown out as a self-evident proposition. It is also affirmed as a truth that no Christian would question, that the Scriptures give reason to hope that universal peace will one day come as a result of our religion, and from this it is held to follow that the custom of war is directly opposed to the Gospel.

At the beginning of this twentieth century, as in the later years of the nineteenth, the foremost literary advocate of peace was Leo Tolstoy, and his inspiration, like that of Penn and Worcester, came from Galilee. His letter to the London *Times* in the summer of 1904, during the Russo-

Japanese war, represents his deepest thought both of war and peace. The motto of the letter, wherein the writer sees the only remedy for war, is the old summons of Jesus and his forerunner, "Bethink yourselves, and believe in the Gospel." True religion—of which "most of the people of our time are deprived," says Tolstoy—true religion, which is love to God and one's neighbor, is the sole power that can exalt the life of humanity above the senseless barbarism of war.

Whatever one may think in regard to Tolstoy's interpretation of the precepts of Jesus, two things are certain, namely, that he saw the ideal for humanity in the spirit of Jesus, and that his preaching of peace on the basis of the Gospel reached and influenced multitudes of men.

From this survey of the greater literary productions which have sought to promote the peace of the world, to which a multitude of less significant writings might be added, it is obvious that throughout the Modern Age, from the time of Grotius to the present day, the Bible has exerted an influence on the sentiment of peace through the agency of books and tracts to which the earlier centuries afford no parallel. It is, of course, quite impossible to tabulate the results of this wide and complex influence in modifying warlike

ardor, in developing strong individual opposition to war, in the gradual transformation of public sentiment, which has called for treaties in growing numbers from the time of Cromwell to the present and that is now promoting in many ways the great cause of arbitration. But while this influence can not be statistically exprest, it is undeniably one of the strong forces in the modern movement for universal peace.

We turn now to consider the Bible's influence on the establishment of institutions of peace. These institutions, with the single exception of God's Peace in the eleventh century, are a growth of the last one hundred years. They fall naturally into two classes, the private and the governmental. It is in the former, as we should expect, that the influence of the Bible is most easily to be traced.

The first Peace Society in the United States (New York City, 1815), and the first in England (1816), were confessedly Christian, being based on the conviction that war is inconsistent with the religion of Jesus. This was true also of the American Peace Society (1828), and eminently true of the various associations of the disciples of George Fox. There are, however, efficient associations for peace whose constitutions make no

use of a Christian or religious motive. In the International League of Peace (1867), it is the progress of civilization which is taken as the basis of organization. War is opposed because it contradicts "all the tendencies of modern civilization," and especially the labor movement.

It is doubtless true that some of these societies which make no use of the Christian motives, have in their membership many who are moved to some extent by the influence of the Bible, and true also that these societies without exception, whatever their constitutions may say, are under obligation to the Bible inasmuch as this has been one of the great and silently diffused forces which together have brought modern civilization into being. But of this indirect and unacknowledged influence of the Bible, we shall not speak. Enough to point to those evidences which do not admit of question.

Reference has been made to the first Peace Societies and their confessedly Christian basis. We may judge of the character and extent of this particular institution of peace from any session of the Universal Peace Congress of recent years, for this Congress reveals the spirit of the Peace Societies as a whole. At the seventeenth Universal Peace Congress, held in London in 1908, twenty-

three countries were represented. There were delegates from 280 different Peace Societies. The entire first day of the deliberations of this Congress was devoted to the Christian aspects of peace and war, and a distinctly Christian note pervaded the discussions of other days.

Notable among the private institutions for peace is the Interparliamentary Union, founded at Paris in 1889. This considers the questions of international peace from the point of view of practical legislation, and, therefore, we do not look for any obvious dependence on the Bible either in its public declarations, or in its discussions. If that book has influence on the men who from year to year constitute the Union, then it helps in so far to mold their policy, and to inspire them with courage to labor for the attainment of the noble end which they set before them, as it certainly helped to inspire Sir Randall Cremer, the founder of the Union. The various measures advocated by the Interparliamentary Union, whether consciously inspired by the Gospel or not, have at least been in accord with its fundamental principle of human brotherhood.

The ideals of international justice and the progress of mankind in material and spiritual welfare which inspired the World Peace Foundation

(July, 1910), and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (December, 1910), are ideals which, tho not created by the Founder of the Christian religion, have been indebted to him for their fairest development, and, therefore, the historian of Christianity would be narrow, indeed, who did not account these great peace institutions, which render the year 1910 forever illustrious, as in a deep and true sense a product of the Gospel.

Significant as are all these private institutions for the promotion of peace, they are, perhaps, less significant than that single institution which is governmental in character—the Hague Conference. The private institutions are evidence that the peace sentiment has risen to a high level in the hearts of individuals and of groups of men; this governmental institution is evidence that the peace sentiment has become a force with the rulers of the nations, or, in other words, has become universal.

The Hague Conferences have no confessed connection with Christianity, or with any religion. The emperor's message of August 24, 1898, proposing a Conference, makes, indeed, a reference to God, but it is purely formal. No conviction is exprest, no hope even, that God would bless

the proposed gathering of the nations. The message is economic with a humanitarian tinge. The development of military equipment is said to check, to paralyse, or to pervert "national culture, economic progress, and the production of wealth." The "ideal toward which the endeavors of all governments should be directed" is the "maintenance of general peace, and a possible reduction of the excessive armaments which weigh upon all nations." The Conferences at The Hague, and the Conventions adopted, like the emperor's message, are neutral, or at least silent on their relation to the Christian religion and its literary basis. Thus they are widely different in form from the work of Grotius. But this difference in form may not imply difference of spirit. The Christian motives may have been operative, and the Christian goal, which is moral and spiritual, may have been present to the thought of many of the delegates to these Conferences, altho in their published utterances they make no appeal to these things. Twenty-one of the twenty-six countries sending delegates to the First Conference are nominally Christian, and thirty-nine of the forty-four that were represented at the Second Conference. It is probably safe to say that a large majority of the men who con-

stituted these historic Conferences would gladly have given their assent to such fundamental Christian teachings as the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Many of them were members of the Christian Church, in one or another of its various branches. Hence, we may readily believe, indeed, we seem to be constrained to believe, that among the silent forces which wrought for the results achieved at The Hague in 1899 and 1907, the teaching of the Bible, and especially the spirit of the Gospel are to be given no unimportant place.

But we would advance beyond probabilities. We raise the question whether this international institution of peace reveals in any clear and definite manner the influence of the Bible, or whether its deliberations and agreements might be credited to men as untouched by the scriptures as Marcus Aurelius, Plotinus, and Socrates. We have said that there is no manifest and obvious dependence of the Conference on Christian teaching, and that the influence of this, if seen at all, will be found to be indirect in character. Is such an influence to be noted in the work of the Conference? We answer this question affirmatively.

In the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of

International Disputes, as adopted in 1899, and again in 1907, the introductory paragraphs advance certain grounds of the contemplated action, and among them the recognition of the "solidarity which unites the members of the society of civilized nations."[7] Now, while a conviction of this *solidarity* of society was held by certain men in classic times, for example, by the Stoics, we may safely trace its existence in the minds of the delegates to the Conference at The Hague in 1899 and 1907, not to the influence of Greek philosophy, but to the Bible, which teaches the doctrine far more impressively than it has ever been taught elsewhere. "The solidarity which unites the members of the society of civilized nations" is not quite the warm doctrine of the brotherhood of man, civilized or uncivilized, but it is doubtless to be traced back to the same source in the New Testament.

Again, the terms in which various Conventions refer to war are noteworthy in the present connection. There is nowhere a suggestion of that conception of war which one sees in Moltke's letter to Blüntschli: "War is one of the elements of order in the world established by God. The

[7] *Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague*, edited by James Brown Scott, pp. 23, 155.

noblest virtues of men are developed therein. Without war the world would degenerate and disappear in a morass of materialism." In the Conventions adopted at The Hague, we find the purpose exprest to mitigate, "as far as possible," the *severity* of the "general laws and customs of war,"[8] to "diminish the severity and *disasters* of war,"[9] to "diminish the *evils* of war so far as military necessities permit,"[10] and to diminish the *inevitable* evils of war."[11] This is the careful language of men officially representing the great governments of the world. It suggests that they regarded war, at its best, as a fruitful source of evils, as a monster, which, since it could not be summarily destroyed, should be caged and confined as far as possible. They would utterly abolish it if they could.

Now, while this view of war *might* spring from an economic or humanitarian study of the subject, and while it might, therefore, be developed among men quite independently of the Christian faith, it will hardly be thought rash and indefensible to hold that in the case of these delegates to the Conferences at The Hague, most of them coming from nominally Christian lands,

[8] See *Texts*, as cited, pp. 203, 252. [9] *Texts*, p. 260.
[10] *Texts*, p. 47. [11] *Texts*, p. 267.

we may trace this conception of war more or less directly to that unparalleled spiritual force which made its appearance in Jesus of Nazareth, and which has been perpetuated by his words and the holy memory of his life.

We have now completed our swift journey through the history of nineteen centuries.

To any observer who stands at the summit of the Christian Scriptures, and contemplates the wars of people who have profest to take those Scriptures as their guide in life, the record of the Bible's influence is one fraught with failure and shame. The achievement falls discouragingly far short of the ideal. But yet at the same time, one who stands at the summit of the Christian Scriptures, appreciating in a measure the divine beauty of its conception of man in the economy of the Kingdom of God, can not yield to the discouragement flowing from even nineteen centuries of war, but looks forward with confidence to centuries made glorious and sacred by a spirit of brotherhood as pure as that of Jesus.

CHAPTER VI

MODERN APPEALS TO THE BIBLE IN SUPPORT OF WAR

THE authority of the Bible has been invoked both for and against every great social, political, and religious movement in Christendom for many centuries. This is a tribute to the Christian's reverence for the Bible, rather than to his good judgment. The appeal to the Bible, both by the subjects of Mars and the advocates of peace, however bewildering and hateful this fact may be, is a natural and inevitable result of two things: the old doctrine that the Scriptures were miraculously produced, and the immense difference between the lowest and the highest teachings which the Bible contains.

If the Bible was miraculously produced, and *ever* justifies war, then the appeal to it in war's support can not be neglected among those who acknowledge its authority. There is power in that appeal, as among our Teutonic ancestors there was power in the belief that the king who led them into battle was descended from their god Woden, the god of war.

And again the vast gulf between the ethics of an Ehud and the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, between the conceptions of God entertained by the wild desert tribes which conquered Canaan in the dim dawn of Hebrew history and by Jesus of Nazareth, the greatest of spiritual prophets, makes it easy to obtain Biblical sanction for the basest, as well as the noblest, impulses of the heart of man.

It should be obvious to every thoughtful mind that one of two things will surely come to pass, either it will be made clear that the Bible can not be fairly quoted on both sides of great moral and religious questions, or the Bible will gradually sink out of sight as an authority among civilized and progressive nations.

It seems, moreover, as tho the beginning of the twentieth century were high time that a serious effort should be made to put an end to the intolerable uncertainty whether the Bible, taken in its entirety or at its highest, is a palladium for the red-handed warrior, or a manual for the friends of peace. It will be the object of the present chapter to consider the appeal which has been made to the Bible in recent times in support of war. We shall limit ourselves, not only to recent times, but also to the

English-speaking peoples, in particular to our war in 1861, and England's war in South Africa in 1899. The appeal made to the Bible during these wars will be taken as fairly representative of the modern Christian attitude on the subject.

This appeal to the Bible, which we are to consider, is met in various forms, sometimes direct, and sometimes indirect, sometimes in the elaborate argument of a sermon, but more often in the allusions or quotations of poems and addresses. There is no essential difference in the method of appeal between the Confederate and the Union man, or between the English Bishop and the Boer General.

Let us turn first to the earlier war, and begin our investigation with the unargumentative, but more subtle and potent appeal that permeates much of the verse dedicated to the conflict of 1861.

Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe in *The Holy War* sees in the northern army a counterpart of that host which was beheld by the author of Revelation, who were clothed in fine linen, white and pure, and who rode upon white horses, following him who is called Faithful and True. We quote a single stanza:

O Brothers, banded for this sacred war,
Keep your white garments spotless still, and pure;
Be priestly warriors, hallowing the right,
So shall your victory be swift and sure.

Thus the writer would have the northern soldier feel that he is a priestly warrior, arrayed in a spotless white garment, and destined, if faithful, to a swift and sure victory. How sadly her Biblical background[1] is misused will appear sufficiently from the single fact that the army which the author of Revelation saw in his vision were *unarmed*. The enemy of Christ, against whom this army goes forth, is overthrown by the mere *word* of his mouth, not by any weapons in the hands of his followers.

Dr. O. W. Holmes, in his *Army Hymn* and his *Parting Hymn*—both quite below his average as poetry—uses Scripture words and symbols in the following stanzas:

O Lord of hosts, Almighty King,
Behold the sacrifice we bring!
To every arm thy strength impart,
Thy Spirit shed through every heart.

And again:

Thine are the scepter and the sword;
Stretch forth thy mighty hand.

In attributing a "sword" to God, the author

[1] Rev. 19:11-16.

virtually adopts the early Old Testament conception of God as a "man of war," and it would seem that he took the title "Lord of hosts" as equivalent to Commander-in-Chief of the army. But thus to speak of God, tho the terms are in the Bible, is not true to the Bible at its highest, and therefore not truly Biblical. It is a recrudescence of the semi-savage views of a remote antiquity.

We find the same conception of God in the more spirited lines of an unknown Southern writer:

> In the name of God we'll meet you,
> With the sword of God we'll greet you,
> By the grace of God we'll beat you,
> On the North Carolina shore.[2]

Both poets claim the God of the Bible for their respective armies, but the point to be especially noted is that their thought of him is one with that which was cherished among the Hebrews a thousand years before Christ.[3] He is a "man of war," the captain now of the Union Army, and anon of the Confederate; it is he who scatters the enemies and makes them fall.

[2] In *Songs for Soldiers*, 1864.

[3] See also *The Battle of Richmond* in *War Songs and Poems of the Confederacy*, 1904.

Bayard Taylor sings to the northern soldiers,

God fights with ye,[4]

and with equal confidence a southern bard exclaims,

The God of battles will listen to our cry.[5]

This conception of God as the "God of battles," a fighting God, dominates Julia Ward Howe's *Battle Hymn of the Republic.* God is here a warrior, with a swift sword; he has an altar among the camp-fires. He whispers to the armed man a "fiery gospel" indeed, telling him that his share in the divine blessing will be according to the manner in which he crushes the "contemners" of God. Christ, too, who "died to make men holy," is brought into the camp abruptly, as a destroyer, as the promised seed of the woman who was to bruise the serpent's head (Gen. 3:15). Thus by a Biblical allusion the southern army is identified with the "serpent," and Jesus, the quiet, spiritual teacher, is invoked to destroy this serpent through the agency of "burnished rows of steel." He or God—it is uncertain which is intended in Mrs. Howe's verse—is also the trumpeter in this war, of

[4] *The Tribune,* May 10, 1861.
[5] Fagan, *Southern War-Songs,* 1890.

course, on the *northern* side, and his trumpet will never call retreat. The Union Army is to go forward until the enemy is destroyed. Then, by a sudden change of symbols, the trumpeter becomes the judge, and is "sifting out the hearts of men," naturally the hearts of *northern* men. It would appear from the context, that the ground of judgment in this sifting process is their attitude toward the serpent-enemy of the South. Then the closing stanza seeks to glorify the northern cause, by treating it as parallel to the world-wide work of Christ—which stanza, it may be noticed in passing, wrongly characterizes both the work of Christ and the northern cause, for the aim of the North was *not* to free the slave, and the work of Christ was by no means the narrow one of setting men free from sin.

The power of this *Battle Hymn* was not different from that of the sermons of Peter the Hermit, who aroused Europe to a passionate crusade to recover the sepulcher of Christ from the Moslems. It subtly identifies God with the northern cause, by the use of Biblical symbols and allusions. The swing of the rhythm, and the inspiriting character of the music to which the words were sung, contributed not a little to its power, but its deepest and mightiest spring was

in the conviction which it breathed into the soul, that the war was God's war, and that the Union Army was called to the glorious work of fighting God's battles with him.

Now it is obvious that the background of this poem is Biblical, but it is also certain that it draws its inspiration from the lowest levels of the infinitely varied Bible story. Its conception of God is common with that of the imprecatory Psalms, and of many pagan writers. It is thoroughly hostile to the conception of Jesus. And Christian people ought at last to agree that an appeal to any Scripture whose spirit is foreign to the Spirit of Jesus is a most dangerous perversion of the Bible.

We turn here from poetry to prose, and shall seek to discover what use was made of the Bible in those dark days of the Civil War, both in the South and in the North. Of course, many Christian writers argued for or against the war without any direct reference to the Bible. The appeal was to political, social, and economic principles. Thus Stephen A. Douglas, addressing the Legislature of Illinois soon after the outbreak of the struggle, justified it on the ground that it was the duty of the North to defend the Government—a note that was often struck by

public speakers and writers; and the war was also defended on the ground that war brings out man's greatest abilities, destroys effeminacy, and teaches self-reliance.[6] But with all such arguments we are not at present concerned.

We shall note first a number of appeals to the Bible which are somewhat general in character.

A Quaker chaplain,[7] on the presentation of a sword to his regiment, declared that all Jewish history is a narrative of wars waged under the direction of the Lord of hosts, and he appealed also to these words of Jesus: "I came not to send peace, but a sword"; and "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one."

There is, indeed, a large element of truth in the assertion that all Jewish history—meaning by that phrase Old Testament history—is a narrative of wars, but the statement that these wars—some of them defensive and with apparent good ground, as Gideon's campaign against the Midianites, and others offensive and destitute of any manifest justification, as the war of extermin-

[6] *Universalist Quarterly*, 19; Horace Greeley in *Independent*, July 25, 1861.

[7] W. J. Mullen, *Address* on Sword Presentation, May, 1862.

ation against the Amalekites—were all waged under the personal direction of the Lord, is a statement before which the moral sense of a Christian ought to shrink back with horror. If the "Lord of hosts" was the God of Jesus, then it is obvious that he never commanded that women and little children should be put to the sword, because their ancestors, two hundred years before, had done an injury to Israel; obvious, also, that he did not inspire the fratricidal wars between Judah and the northern tribes, which were sometimes wars of revenge, of greèd, and of ambition. These wars were no better, and perhaps no worse, than the wars waged in those generations outside of Palestine, and to say that they were waged under the direction of the Lord of hosts is to concede that this Lord of hosts was of a wholly different spirit from the God of Jesus and the Gospel.

But our Quaker chaplain cited, in support of the war, two sayings of Jesus, which also before his day had been made to render the same service. We might have said *forced* to render the same service, for surely it is only by violence that they are made to justify war. Let Jesus explain his own word. He said that he came to send a "sword," that is (Matt. 10:35), to set a man

at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother. His mission—in its negative aspect only—was to part near kindred and friends, but this separation was caused by their varying attitudes toward him. Hence the division of which he spoke was in the sphere of *religion*, not of politics, and the "sword" symbolized the antagonism between those who accepted him and those who rejected him. But was the Civil War raised on that issue? If not, no one has a right to justify it by reference to this word of Jesus. It is clear that he was speaking of the relation of men to himself, and as his claims were fundamental, so their acceptance by some, and their rejection by others, must necessarily make a sharp cleavage between the two parties. The Gospel of Jesus is continually dividing households to-day in missionary lands, and this division exactly illustrates what he meant by sending a "sword."

The second saying was this: "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one." It was the last evening of Jesus' life—the hour of sharp crisis, both for him, and for his disciples. He would put them on their guard against approaching peril. At an earlier day, in Galilee, he had sent them out on a gracious mis-

sion, without purse, or wallet, or shoes, and yet they had lacked nothing, for they found friends to supply all their needs. The case was soon to be greatly changed. He himself was about to be reckoned with transgressors, and surely his disciples would have to encounter bitter opposition.[8] They must therefore be prepared, must be armed, must have "swords."

Were there the slightest doubt regarding the correctness of this interpretation, it would be entirely dispelled by the sequel, for the disciples, promptly misunderstanding Jesus' reference to a sword, reminded him that they had two, and he replied, "It is *enough.*" But, obviously, *two* swords were not enough to defend his life from his strong and determined foes; *two* swords were not enough for war. They *were,* however, enough, and even *one* was enough, to convey his thought of being *prepared* for the time of stress that was approaching.

If such misuse of Scripture were rare, or of little influence, we might stop at this point, but the facts are quite the reverse; and since the character of Jesus is the greatest asset of history, any honest misuse of his words is a matter of utmost concern to all friends of religious pro-

[8] See, *e.g.*, Matt. 10:24, 28.

gress. We shall, therefore, consider the Quaker[9] chaplain's citations from another point of view.

Every man may fairly demand that his single utterances, especially if they are at all doubtful in themselves, shall be looked at in the light of his life and teaching as a whole. Let us grant this privilege to Jesus. He said that he came not to send peace, but a sword, and again told his disciples, on a certain occasion, that a sword was needful to each one of them. But does his career of humble service, in which he refused to be made king, and refused to take sides on political questions—a career crowned by a voluntary sacrifice of life—does this career justify even a suspicion that when, on these two occasions, he employed the word *sword,* he was sanctioning war for his disciples? Or does his teaching in general, which may all be summed up under the two heads of the loving character of God, and the duty of man to be a son of God, and a brother to every other man—does this teaching allow even a suspicion that, when he spoke of having come to send a sword, and of the need which each of his disciples would soon

[9] It may be remarked that Mr. Mullen's position was quite exceptional for a Friend, and that he was at once answered by another Friend, the Reverend A. H. Love.

have of possessing a sword, he was sanctioning war? The supposition is surely too preposterous to be entertained for an instant, except where the passion for war has arisen, and has utterly blinded the mind to obvious truth. It is as grave a wrong to Jesus, to drag these words into the arena of war, as it is to the God of whom Jesus taught to say that he inspired and directed the wars of the ancient Hebrews.

While the Quaker chaplain was seeking to defend war, in particular the war against the South by these appeals to Scripture, a southern writer argued from the Bible that the disruption of the Union was God's will, since *whatever* changes come to pass in the world's history, tho men may be responsible for them, as the North was responsible for the war of 1861, are nevertheless ordered of God.[10] Against this view that the Bible teaches a doctrine of absolute fatalism, it is hardly worth the while to present arguments. The average mind finds it difficult to believe that God orders a certain war, and yet, at the same time, holds those guilty who wage it, and the average reader of the Bible has never found this to be its general teaching.

We may fitly notice in this connection that

[10] Holt Wilson, *Southern Literary Messenger*, Oct., 1861.

Bishop Meade, of Virginia, writing in support of a peaceful separation of the South from the North, appealed to an incident in Old Testament history, namely, Shemaiah's protest to King Rehoboam, that he should not wage war against the ten tribes of Israel, who had separated from Judah.[11] This protest the prophet rested on the word of Jehovah to him, who said: "Ye shall not go up nor fight against your brethren, the children of Israel, for *this thing is of me.*"[12] The Bishop argued in a kindly and temperate manner, that the two cases were analogous, and that the divine prohibition to Rehoboam was equally applicable to the North and the South in 1861. But surely this use of Scripture is extremely hazardous. To establish between the political situation in Palestine, eight centuries before Christ, and the political situation in America in 1861, such an analogy that one may apply the prophet's word to this later situation, with the authority of a divine command, is on the face of it utterly impossible. The bare fact of the separation of one political organism into two organisms, is all that the two historical events have in common. Otherwise, they are totally disparate.

[11] *The Tribune*, May 20, 1861. [12] 1 Kings, 12: 21-24.

We pass on now from these somewhat general appeals to the Bible to certain specific instances.

Dr. Edward Everett Hale preached a sermon in Boston, in September, 1862, and repeated it several times in other places, which was entitled, *The Desert and the Promised Land*, the text being Num. 13-14. The Civil War had now continued for nearly a year and a half, and the preacher felt that the hour was critical. The North needed a deeper sense of its obligation to "put through God's great purposes in this affair." In order to produce this deepened sense of obligation among Christian people, Dr. Hale appealed to the story of the Spies, and argued that the situation in America, in the fall of 1862, was parallel to that when Joshua and Caleb brought back to the hosts of Israel their report of the Promised Land. Israel, however, failed to enter Canaan, and thus brought upon themselves the grievous judgment of a forty-years' wandering in the desert. So would it be in our case, if we of the North failed to "put through God's great purposes." Sore judgment would come upon us, nothing less than a perpetual warfare between North and South. God had revealed himself in the conflict thus far as "our leader into the promised land of a higher social

life." His design for us was manifest, his promise clearer than that to Israel.

Thus the preacher, who later won a well-deserved fame as an advocate of peace, sought to stimulate warlike zeal by his appeal to an incident in Israel's history, with which our own situation was supposed to be parallel. The entire force of his argument depends on the question whether there was a real and vital parallelism. To establish such a parallelism it would seem to be necessary to make clear at least these points, namely, that we, that is the North, had been commanded by God to go up and possess some "promised land"—Dr. Hale says the promised land of a higher social life—and that we had previously been informed by reliable witnesses, who had explored this land, that we were well able to overcome it.

But what witnesses had informed us that we were well able to conquer this "higher social life"—by which Dr. Hale meant the blotting out of slavery in the South—and where was the prophet who had received from God a command to go up and possess this promised land? Surely, it was not Mr. Lincoln, the most prophetic man of that period, for he said in his First Inaugural Address, touching the institution of slavery,

which Dr. Hale regarded as standing in the way to the promised land of a higher social life: "I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States, where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so."

The simple fact is that the North had received no divine command to exterminate slavery, and no reliable witnesses had informed us that we were well able to conquer the promised land of this "higher social life." Thus the supposed parallelism vanishes on closer examination, and with it disappears also any legitimate power of the Biblical incident to establish the point for which the preacher contended.[13]

The character of many appeals to the Bible, in the time of the Civil War, is well illustrated by a Thanksgiving sermon[14] of September 11, 1864.[15] The text was the "inspired war-song of Deborah and Barak." This song was said to prove that "war has sometimes received the express sanction of God." If we ask how this

[13] Comp., for similar use of the Bible, the *Presbyterian Quarterly Review*, 1862, *The Two Rebellions*.

[14] *The Patriot's Song of Victory*, E. L. Cleaveland.

[15] A day specially set apart in view of recent victories of our arms.

song proves the great assertion, we are referred to its *inspired* character. But does the song *claim* to be inspired? No. Then who vouches for its divine inspiration? The same one, of course, who wrought out the doctrine—that is, the early Church. Thus, we are asked to believe that an ancient Hebrew war-song proves that "war has sometimes received the express sanction of God," and are asked to believe it, on the ground of the doctrine of supernatural inspiration. But, if that doctrine is merely an unproved hypothesis, an hypothesis, moreover, against which the Bible itself brings various invincible arguments, then the assertion that God has sometimes expressly sanctioned war, still awaits other confirmation than Deborah's song affords. We do not say that no confirmation *exists,* but only that the assertion of our Thanksgiving sermon, and a thousand more of the same sort, rests not on the plain word of the Bible itself, but *solely* on a late doctrine concerning the *origin* of the Bible.

Once admit the doctrine, and the most amazing things can readily be developed from the Scriptures, as witness the manner in which the sermon in question "demonstrates" that the New Testament approves what the writer had found

in the song of Deborah. This "demonstration" is typical of the method of all writers who have held the doctrine of supernatural inspiration, and is, therefore, deserving of notice. The New Testament, says the writer, confirms his assertion regarding the sense of Deborah's song, by "enumerating" Barak in Hebrews 11:32. Let not the scope of this claim be missed. Barak is named by the unknown author of Hebrews among the Old Testament characters who had "faith," and this same Barak is said to have sung, with Deborah, the song of the text (Judges 5). *Therefore,* the New Testament—all its twenty-seven books, which were written by different men, during a period of about a century—the New Testament, as a whole, and not merely the letter to the Hebrews, is seen to approve the claim that God has sometimes expressly sanctioned war! Are we dealing with the incalculable utterances of one who is demented? By no means, but with the sober statement of an upright citizen, who is unconsciously illustrating, as thousands of others have done, the infinite absurdities which flow logically from the doctrine of supernatural inspiration in its strict historical form. Let the gist of the argument be stated again, for the underlying method may be met

to-day in the pulpit and in the religious press, and nothing more destructive of the Bible's legitimate influence has ever been discovered by the folly or madness of men. Barak fought in association with Deborah, in a certain battle of ancient times, and he sang with her the song of victory. Now one of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament mentions Barak's name among Old Testament men who had faith. Therefore, the New Testament "approves" the declaration that God "sometimes expressly sanctions war." That is to say, the New Testament library is *unanimous* on every point mentioned by *any* contributor to its pages! Beautiful illusion, but capable of being held only by one who is ignorant of the facts. Instead of being unanimous on every point, the writings of the New Testament are widely various, and at times contradictory. It is, therefore, most erroneous to say, for instance, that Jesus must approve the sentiments in the song of Deborah and Barak, because the name of Barak is honorably mentioned in the epistle to the Hebrews. A method of handling the Bible, which legitimately leads to such results as this, ought to be abhorred by all intelligent beings.

Horace Bushnell was one of the most eminent

preachers in the period of the Civil War, and I wish to make a passing reference to a general utterance of his in a sermon of 1861. "Peace," he said, "will do for angels, but war is God's ordinance for sinners, and they want the schooling of it often." Whence did Bushnell derive the principle which he so unhesitatingly enunciates, that war is God's ordinance for sinners? Probably from the Old Testament, especially from the books of Kings, which Ulphilas, fourteen centuries earlier, had wisely omitted from his translation of the Scriptures, on account of the warlike character of the Goths among whom he labored. Whether the Christian Church should now omit the books of Kings is a question I shall not discuss, but it would seem that the Church as *Christian* is clearly bound to *ignore* any doctrine of the Old Testament which does not square with the teaching of Jesus. If his teaching justifies the statement that war is God's ordinance for sinners, and that they need the schooling of it often, then let it be made by those who preach in his name, but if not—and history does not record that anyone ever derived it thence—then it has no more right to be heard in a Christian pulpit than the ethics of Mohammed, or the precepts of Pharaoh.

The appeal to the Bible during the Civil War —and the same may be said of the Christian appeal at almost all times—was very largely an appeal to the Old Testament. Hardly more than one New Testament passage is cited for ten from the Old Testament. Out of many scores of addresses and sermons, published during the Civil War, I have found but three which make direct and serious appeal to the New Testament, and no one of these is to the words of Jesus.

The word of Paul to the Romans (13:2), "He that resisteth the power (government) withstandeth the ordinance of God," was held to show that the *South were fighting against God.*[16] The writer thus assumes, as many others have done, both in connection with this word and with other passages of Scripture, that the principle of Paul's word is of universal and eternal validity, that it is just as applicable in a Republic, whose Constitution was "ordained" by the people, as in a Monarchy, whose head was everywhere believed to be divinely chosen, if not directly sprung from one of the gods. But one is not justified in making this assumption. The epistle to the Romans was *for* the Romans—the Roman Christians of the middle of the

[16] Howard Crosby, *God's View of Rebellion,* Sept. 11, 1864.

first century. Whether, and how far it was applicable to the Christians of Alexandria or Jerusalem, in that age, whether and how far it was applicable to the people of the United States in 1861, are legitimate questions, and they can not be disregarded without endangering one's interpretation of the apostle. He who disregards them thereby forfeits any claim he might have had to speak with the authority of the Bible.

It was common among Christian people to regard the Civil War as a divine judgment on our country for its many and grievous sins, especially the sin of slavery. When thus viewed, it was, of course, regarded as a righteous war. "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." Here again the thought of the times was determined by the Old Testament. It is there that war, famine, and pestilence are regarded as God's sore judgments, to which wild beasts are sometimes added as a fourth.[17] But we wish to notice now in particular one aspect of this general thought for which New Testament authority was adduced. "For the sins of our country there was no remission," it was said, "but by shedding of

[17] *E.g.*, Ezek., 5:17.

blood.[18] The Scripture background for this assertion was Hebrews 9:22. But this background is no background, for the author of Hebrews speaks of the blood of *calves and goats,* but he does not speak of the shedding of *human* blood, except only that of Christ. It is impossible, therefore, to discover in this passage a justification for the remarkable view that the bloodshed of the Civil War was necessary to the forgiveness of our country's sins. We would not deny that those sins may, in a sense, have led to the war, or that our desire for justice in the government of the world may find satisfaction in the fact that national sins of great magnitude were followed by severe national sufferings; we only observe that this specific appeal to the Bible, in justification of the Civil War, was utterly unwarranted.

This series of appeals to the Bible in support of the Civil War may well end with one that literally takes us into the clouds. It is the appeal to that passage in the book of Revelation (12:7-12), which speaks of a war in heaven between Michael and the Devil, and of its consequences for the earth.[19] It was argued

[18] C. A. Bartol, *Sermon,* 1862.

[19] J. P. Thompson, *Advancement of Christ's Kingdom by War.*

from this passage that *right* wars—ours was, of course, such an one!—have their beginning in heaven, and that in such wars the armies are moved by forces mightier than themselves, that is, on the one side by loyal angels, and on the other side by Satan and his evil hosts.

This view of the situation was naturally comforting for a northern audience. A southern preacher might have used the same text, only he would have claimed that the loyal angels were on *his* side, and Satan on the other side. And he would have had just as good a right to use the text in this manner as the northern preacher had to his interpretation, for the passage offered no valid support to either. For, granting that Michael and Satan are spiritual realities, and that they once marshalled their hosts against each other, with the result that the latter was worsted, and granting, also, that Michael was in the right, and his war a divine necessity, it does not quite appear how that conflict justified the Civil War of 1861, or how we can safely claim even the remotest connection between them. Again, even tho we should grant that Satan has been especially wrathful since that defeat by Michael, and has been unusually active against mankind, it does not appear to be

quite obvious that he is able to take possession of armies, or, in particular, that he did actually take possession of the southern armies in 1861. These are prodigious assumptions, clearly unprovable, and therefore we must say that this appeal to Scripture was vain.

We now pass onward from the Civil War of 1861 to the English-Boer War of 1899—that "unpleasant chapter" in England's history, to quote the euphemistic language of *The Times*. Of the parties in this war it could have been said, as Mr. Lincoln said of the North and the South:[20] "Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God, and each invokes his aid against the other. . . . The prayers of both could not be answered—that of neither has been answered fully."

As between Briton and Boer in their relation to the Bible during this war, the former appealed to it far less than the latter, partly, no doubt, because conscious of the great superiority of his military establishment, and partly, it may be, because he regarded the Boer as uncivilized, as no better than the "beastly" Canaanites whom Israel was supposed to have been divinely commanded to exterminate. The most popular poets of the

[20] *Second Inaugural Address.*

time were forward and uncontrolled in speaking evil both of Mr. Kruger and of the Boers in general,[21] and the daily press with little exception emphasized the inferiority of the Boers.

But, whatever the cause may have been, the fact is plain that the Briton looked to the Bible for support in the war far less than did the Boer. For him the religious consideration was always prominent, while in England it was subordinate. Even the staunch opponents of the war in England did not put the religious motive so in the foreground as did the Boers. Of the ten reasons given by Mr. Stead, in December of 1899, for stopping the war at that time, only one is religious, that is, directly and distinctively. The clergy were overwhelmingly in favor of the war, and prayers were said in most of the churches for its success, but its *justice* seems not to have been often defended by appeals to the Bible.

A preacher at St. Paul's, London, declared the necessity of wars in general—the necessity of that in South Africa was implied—on the basis of Matt. 24:6: "Ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars; see that ye be not troubled; for these things must needs come to pass; but the

[21] Kipling, *The Old Issue,* Oct. 9, 1899. Swinburne, *The Transvaal,* Oct. 9, 1899.

end is not yet." It is well to pause here a moment, to see whether the appeal to the Bible in St. Paul's, London, is more forcible than that of the Boer farmers in the Transvaal, to which we shall presently refer. One is staggered, at the outset, by the fact that words of the first century, spoken in view of the near approach of the "end" should be unhesitatingly used as applicable at the close of the nineteenth century when the approach of the "end" was no longer a living issue. Moreover, an archdeacon of St. Paul's, in the year 1899, should have known, what we could not expect of the Boers, that there is very grave doubt whether the words in question were spoken by Jesus or were merely a part of the current Jewish doctrine in regard to the end of the present age, and therefore he should have refrained from using the text in justification of the claim that wars are necessary now, and are to be necessary to the end.

The words of the Bishop of Lincoln[22] may be noted in passing, for they imply an important truth. "The Scriptures," he said, "appear to me to allow war where unavoidable, but to teach us to strive for peace." "The Scriptures"—Old Testament and New Testament, the Scriptures

[22] *The Message of the War*, December, 1899.

as a whole. But are the books of Kings and the Sermon on the Mount in accord on this subject? And are the books of Kings authoritative for the Church, unless in unquestionable agreement with the mind of Jesus? The books of Kings, and many other books of the Old Testament, abound in wars, and say nothing against them. Doubtless *they* "allow war," as they also countenance slavery and polygamy, and if they are authoritative for the Church, then plainly Christians may practise slavery and polygamy. But if only that is authoritative for Christians which is in accord with the Gospel, then it is not to the point to say that the "*Scriptures* appear to allow war where unavoidable." If *Jesus* allows war, let his words be cited in its justification, but let not the Christian pulpit be guilty of an indiscriminate appeal to the "Scriptures," for it ought now to be patent to any intelligent man that by this method of indiscriminate appeal the highest and most sacred truths of the Gospel may be utterly subverted.

In the prayers issued by the Archbishops in December, 1899, for use during the war, we read as follows: "Most merciful Father, we humbly beseech thee, let thy protecting care be over those who have now gone forth to fight the

battles of their country for the deliverance of the opprest, and for the maintenance of justice and equity between man and man."

Now we may not be ready to say with the Vicar of Plumpton that "to pray for the success of such a war, it is the Devil, not God, who should be addrest,"[23] but we must say this, that the Archbishops have made a very questionable use of Scripture. For the "most merciful Father" is the God of Jesus, the God of the New Testament, the God of love and human brotherhood, and Jesus never spoke of the possibility of war among his disciples, even if he conceded it among the "nations." There seems to be a strange, if not blasphemous, incongruity involved when the "most merciful Father" is invoked to give success to the arms of the Britons against the Boers, when Boers and Britons alike are called by the name of his son.

In other words, the Archbishops were guilty of trying to blend the supreme doctrine of Christianity with the common view of the Old Testament and of contemporary heathenism, that God is a "man of war," a God of battles, one who marches at the head of his chosen people for the destruction of his enemies. So to use

[23] *War against War*, Jan. 19, 1900.

the Bible is surely a most subtle misuse of it. The highest is dragged down to sanctify what, if not the lowest, is nevertheless relatively low. It is practically the same ruinous perversion of Scripture that is met in the construction of various doctrines of the Church, for instance, that of the Person of Christ, where the words of the Old Testament have as much weight as the words of Jesus himself. So to handle the Bible is to destroy with one stroke all the spiritual progress achieved from Moses to Jesus, the rich accumulations made by the profound thought and patient sufferings of many generations.

The Boer's appeal to the Bible was the most constant and most sincere that had been made since the time of Cromwell. An English writer, speaking of the conservatism of President Kruger, complained that in reading his Bible he stopt at Malachi.[24] This is largely true, tho in Mr. Kruger's dispatches to his Generals, in June and July of 1900, he quoted the New Testament much oftener than the Old, but the complaint could have been urged with equal, if not greater, force against the English themselves. They stopt at Malachi—they who urged the war—for they thought of the Boers as the Old Testa-

[24] Herbert Paul, *Contemporary Review*, 76.

ment speaks of the Canaanites. So true was this, so far was the dominant public sentiment from the spirit of the Gospel, that among the minority the despairing question was asked, "Is Christianity dead?"

It has always been true that an appeal to the Bible in support of war has been an appeal to the Old Testament, but this was no more marked in the case of the Boers than it was among us during the Civil War. The Boers saw in their recent history a counterpart of Israel's deliverance from Egypt,[25] and President Kruger saw as many miracles in that history as are recorded in the Old Testament story. The Boers were spared in the Jameson Raid, to quote a single instance of these miraculous interventions, because "the Lord ordered the flight of the bullets." The Boer appeal to the Old Testament was neither better nor worse than that of the Puritans in Cromwell's day, or that of the Americans in 1861. It was sincere, but ignorant and wholly invalid.

On President Kruger, as an interpreter of Scripture, we have sufficient light in his Inaugural Address.[26] Speaking to the clergy, he exhorted

[25] See Ben Viljoen in *War against War*, Oct. 20, 1899.

[26] Text in *Memoirs of Paul Kruger*, 1902.

them to be like Abel, not like Cain. Then follows this truly medieval passage (abbreviated): Abel took a lamb for sacrifice: this refers to Christ; he prayed in the Spirit that the punishment which he had deserved might fall upon the Lamb, as otherwise he would suffer eternal death. God accepted the sacrifice, and so we have in this passage the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost!

One who could thus discover the doctrine of the Trinity in the story of Cain and Abel could, of course, find countless supports for war in Scripture, especially in the Old Testament; and one who, in his Inaugural Address, as President of the Boer Republic, gave such prominence to the Bible, was likely to appeal to it on all occasions, even in the dispatches to his Generals in the field. If he knew how to find ample justification for the war with England in the Bible, he also knew how to find there an explanation of the reverses which his armies experienced, and the exegesis is of the same sort and value.

In the speech of May 7, 1900, Mr. Kruger appealed to Revelation, to the vision of the conflict between the people of God and the Beast. He said it was evident that the Beast—by which he meant England—had received power to perse-

cute the Church, and he held that this persecution would continue until the Lord should say to it, "Hitherto, but no further!" This period of suffering, however, was no evidence that their cause was weak: it simply showed that the Church needed to be purified. On the 20th of June, in a dispatch to the Generals, he followed out the same thought, and declared that they who were true to the faith would be received into the Millennial Kingdom.

This reading of the book of Revelation is, of course, utterly crude and groundless, and only serves to heighten the wholly unreliable character of President Kruger's appeal to the Bible in connection with his country's war.

We notice, in conclusion, the conference of the Boer Generals relative to peace.[27] In word and spirit this conference reminds one of the seventeenth century Puritanism. "It had been God's will," said General Froneman, "that the war should take place, and, therefore, they must carry it through." General De La Rey was willing to admit that they might have been mistaken, but added that true faith consists in saying, "Lord, thy will, not mine, be done." De Wet believed with President Kruger that miracles

[27] Christian Rudolph de Wet, *The Three Years' War*, 1902.

had been wrought in behalf of his countrymen since the outbreak of the war, and therefore, it was hard for him to believe that the war ought to be discontinued, even tho the little army of patriots had been reduced to a mere handful, in comparison with the immense military equipment of their adversary.

Thus, these brave men, whose land was overrun by an irresistible foe, struggled with the problem of peace *versus* war. To them it was an intensely religious and Biblical problem. They lost their fight, but not because their interpretation of the Bible in regard to war was less accurate than that of the English. On neither the one side nor the other was there, so far as we can discover, any appeal to the Bible in justification of the war, which can be regarded as even remotely valid. The same must be said of the appeal to Scripture made by the North and the South in the time of our Civil War. It was sincere, but invalid. In both cases men sought Scripture authorization for waging war against each other, and they found it with equal facility—the North against the South, and the South against the North, the Briton against the Boer, and the Boer against the Briton.

We might extend our survey to wars between

other Christian nations, but the two which have been considered adequately represent all.

We shall, therefore, conclude this chapter with some remarks on the radical defects of the method of appealing to the Bible which has been illustrated in the foregoing pages. For let it be said again, we owe it both to the Bible and to our own intelligence to cease from this folly of appeal, or, to speak in more general terms, to cease from the ignorant and superstitious use of the Bible. This is a most practical subject, and will continue to be such while the Bible holds its present place in the Christian world.

The first defect in all this appeal to the Bible in support of war is its utter neglect of development within the Bible. When will the Church recognize that this neglect is fatal to any large and liberating influence of the Scriptures? It has been the bane of theology from the beginning, and heavy fetters on the feet of progress, both moral and religious. Were it not an obvious fact—this blind use of the Bible—no intelligent person would believe it possible.

It is not difficult to take the measure of this neglect, for, clearly, it amounts to giving the same sanction to the book of Kings and the words of Jesus, to the Song of Deborah and the

Twenty-third Psalm. If we may do this, then war is divinely authorized, even wars of extermination, and the atrocities which have been perpetrated this very year in the Balkan States may be approved of God, for they do not exceed in cruelty some of the martial deeds of the chosen people. But the better mind of Christendom abhors this atrocious and selfish warfare, and believes it to be utterly hateful to the God of Jesus. In so doing we virtually condemn the Old Testament ethics of war, and can not consistently appeal to it as Christian men.

A second defect in this appeal to the Bible in support of war, which we have been considering, is the false assumption that whatever is contained in Scripture is of universal and perpetual force.

It is constantly forgotten that the separate writings of the Bible, even those which are most clearly historical, were tracts for the times, messages called out by definite concrete situations, which changed widely from generation to generation, and which, from the nature of the case, can never be reproduced. This is not equivalent to saying that the Bible belongs wholly to the past—by no means; it is only a warning against the careless and irreligious application of Scripture texts to modern situations.

Grant for the moment—what I would not at all seriously admit—that God approved of a warlike invasion of Canaan by the Hebrews, and even commanded a campaign of extermination against the Amalekites, what bearing has that on the Civil War of 1861, or on England's war in South Africa? Shall we be guilty of arguing that because God enjoined war upon a people three thousand years ago, he therefore approves of war to-day? But, in that interval, the entire structure of society has been profoundly altered, man's outlook on life has become radically different, and the obligations of citizenship in the world are not what they were in the days of Jehu and Manasseh.

Suppose we grant that God once commanded his people to destroy women and little children, shall we assume that such a command is, therefore, possible to-day among peoples who for centuries have had the Gospel of Jesus in their hands? Grant that Paul, writing under a monarchical government in the middle of the first century, wisely enjoined on Roman Christians to be subject to the existing powers, shall we straightway derive therefrom a universal and eternal principle that every government is ordained of God, and that resistance to it is resistance to him?

That would be letting a blind reverence for Scripture usurp the place of common sense. "New occasions teach new duties." New environment and new ideals may, indeed, make "ancient good uncouth." The Bible teaches that God is a living and self-revealing God, and history shows that "the thoughts of man are widened with the process of the suns." Surely then to seek to shut up God within the letter of any ancient writing, is to doom one's self to fall behind in the march of progress.

Such fundamental principles as the duty of loving God supremely, and loving our neighbor as ourselves, seem to possess the attribute of finality, but that can not be predicated of any outward custom or institution. The institutions and laws of the Old Testament disappeared under the quickening spirit of the Gospel, and in like manner the laws and institutions of the Church may yet disappear before a fuller realization of that same spirit.

It is an unchristian act to appeal to the Old Testament on any subject, save as the Old Testament word is in manifest accord with the spirit of Jesus. In like manner, it is unchristian to appeal to the New Testament, for example, to Paul, unless that principle which is brought for-

ward as the basis of action is unequivocally approved by the Master.

If these positions are correct, then the entire fabric of appeal to the Bible in support of war, as contained in those writings which have been considered in this chapter, falls to the ground. A *Christian* doctrine on the subject must be born of the spirit of Jesus, and move on the high plane of his Gospel.

CHAPTER VII

THE BIBLE, THE CHURCH, AND UNIVERSAL PEACE

THE Bible is dead in itself. It is merely paper and ink. Fire burns it, and worms eat it, as readily as they do other books. It contains high explosives, but they are quite harmless until taken into a man's vital system. It is, indeed, a book of life, but only as life lays hold on it, and appropriates it. It contains good food for heart and mind, but like the grains of wheat in the wrappings of a mummy, this must first be ground and baked, and then must be transformed by the miracle of life into life-giving sustenance.

It is only the inspired man who finds in the Bible the vision of a new heaven and a new earth, and also strength unfailing to labor for the realization of that fair vision. To the uninspired individual or church the book is a fetish or task, a book of curious history, or perhaps an interesting section of the religious library of the human race.

If man needs the Bible, the Bible is equally

in need of man. It is not in itself a force in the world. It is not a promoter of war, or of peace. It is simply a potential force, capable of inciting to war, and capable of fostering peace. It is an armory with stacks of small arms and a number of pieces of heavy ordnance: it is also a temple of peace, venerable and impressive. Both the armory and the temple are under a single roof—incongruous proximity! There are competent guides to this ancient and complex structure, but they are not much set by in the Church. It is customary for each man who is interested to get in and take what he likes.

This, then, is the first fact to be recognized by those who, in their plans for the good of humanity, build their hopes more or less upon the Bible. It is only a potency, a germ, and is utterly powerless in itself to do either good or ill. Whether we find its origin in God, or in man, it is quite plain that it must now take its chance with other potential forces of civilization. It is not self-propelling or self-sufficient.

The next fact to be recognized by those who look to the Bible as a great promoter of peace, is even more important than the one just mentioned, and, unfortunately, it is not yet self-evident to all people. This is the need of discrimination

in the use of the Bible. It is not a unit, a homogeneous whole, but a most miscellaneous group of writings. At its lowest it is far behind the present stage of civilization; at its highest it is still far in advance of the present day. It contains widely divergent views, even on the highest subjects of religion, as the character of God and the service that is pleasing to him. The difference between the religion of the prophets and that of the law is the difference between spiritual freedom and spiritual bondage. To a large extent they exclude one another. There is a gulf between the Old Testament and the Gospel which is bridged only between Jesus and the greatest prophets. How wide this gulf is may be seen, for example, in such words of Jesus as these: "Ye have heard that it was said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: but I say unto you, Resist not him that is evil"; and again, "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies."

This is a complete contrast of principles, not a grading up in the realization of one and the same ethical standard.

To add another fundamental contrast, one might cite the divergent conceptions of a coming

Deliverer, which are contained in the Old Testament, not to mention the contrast between any one of these and Jesus. Thus, on one hand, we have a king upon the throne of Israel, ruling with a rod of iron, having dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth, and on the other side, we see a gentle sufferer, one who does not break the bruised reed, a man or sorrows, wounded for our transgressions. These two conceptions were not united in Jesus, and they can not be united in a single character.

But the problem presented by such contrasts is, perhaps, no greater than that which is presented by the fact of development. Consider this for a moment. Jesus recognized certain principles of the law as valid, but then substituted for them higher principles. He built upon the prophets, yet he transcended the purest prophetic vision. The highest conception of God to be found in the writings of the Old Covenant is enlarged and ennobled in the Gospel. The possibilities of human life, as illustrated in Jesus, make the passing from the Old Testament to the Gospel like a change of worlds.

It is obvious to thoughtful people that this fact of development lays upon the Christian a

deep and far-reaching obligation. His plane of life must be the plane of the *consummation* of this development. Whatever lay behind Jesus must lie behind the followers of Jesus. One might as well attempt to serve God and Mammon at the same time, as attempt to be loyal to the Gospel, and also to the Judaism of Ezra. "Thou shalt hate thine enemy" can not lodge in the same breast with "Thou shalt love thine enemy."

The Jew of to-day who refuses to accept Jesus as the Messiah of Israel is no more inconsistent than the Christian who, accepting Jesus as his spiritual guide, uses the law and the Gospel indiscriminately. This is the undoing of Jesus. This is to make the Gospel a mere continuation of the earlier sacred writings.

It is then a most Christian act and duty to discriminate in the use of the Bible, and this discrimination means the unhesitating rejection of everything that is in anywise hostile to the Gospel, or that does not breathe the Gospel spirit.

But the Church has not discriminated in its use of the Bible as it should have done. On the great subject of the Bible's relation to war it has not discriminated *at all*. Whenever there has been a war to promote or defend, the Old Testament has been summoned to the task. It

has been regarded as a sufficient and final authority. The Church has not bidden the advocates of war to look at their cause in the light of the Gospel. It has not insisted that the books of Kings, and the imprecatory Psalms, the stories of carnage in Joshua and Judges, are not the source of Christian inspiration for the settlement of disputes. No, it has rather opened these very writings, and brought thence fuel to feed the flames of war.

Sometimes the Church has sought to justify this appeal to the Old Testament by saying that whatever in the old writings Jesus did not explicitly *condemn* he must be regarded as having *approved*. Therefore, as he nowhere declared that the Lord is *not* a "man of war," and nowhere said, Thou shalt *not* fight, his disciples are quite justified in making war when it seems to be to their advantage, quite justified in walking in the good old way of the Kings of Israel, quite justified in regarding their enemies as the enemies of God, and in treating them as the chosen people of old treated the Canaanites. But so to speak and act is to crucify the spirit of the Gospel. Must he, whose life and words were wholly consecrated to a revelation of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man,

instruct his disciples that the fatherhood of God excludes all cruel and partial treatment of his children, and that the brotherhood of man excludes hatred of man? Jesus assumed that his disciples were neither blind nor perverse. He kindled in the hearts of his disciples a spirit of trust and love, and wisely left them to read the old sacred writings in the light and warmth of this spirit.

The Church, we say, has not discriminated between the spirit of the Old Testament and the spirit of Jesus in its use of the Bible in relation to war. It has not stood with Jesus, but rather with Moses, and with Joshua the son of Nun, and with David, one time a soldier of fortune in the employ of Achish of Gath. It has not set itself boldly and persistently against war. It has not met the cry for war with the demand that every brotherly effort be made to keep the peace. Its preachers have not lifted the curtain on the horrors of war, or thrown themselves between the embittered parties as representatives of the God of peace, seeking to allay human passion. From the era of Constantine, when the emperor employed the cross as an all-powerful charm and had a completely equipped church in his camp, down to this very year of grace (1913)

in which a "holy" war has been proclaimed against the Turk by a nominally Christian king, the leaders of the Church have never stood forth fearlessly and unitedly as advocates of peace. Before the Reformation of the sixteenth century the head of the Church gave his blessing, not only to the leaders and armies who marched against the infidel, but also to leaders and armies who marched against fellow believers, and since the Reformation, both the Head of the Roman Church and the leaders of the Protestant bodies have usually been with the majority who called for war, rather than the few who sought peace.

We would not undervalue the service of the Church in the cause of peace. It has kept a little flame burning on the altar of peace through many bloody centuries. The most potent voices that have been lifted up against war, as those of Catherine of Siena, the Lollards, John Bright, and W. T. Stead, have usually been the voices of men and women who were identified with the Church, and who drew their inspiration from the Gospel; but thus far these voices have been few and little heeded. The better way has been pointed out, but the Church has not followed.

It can not be gainsaid that up to the present day the Church has failed, grievously failed, to

stand with Jesus for peace. What is to be its record in the years before us? It holds, in Christendom, the balance of power between war and peace. One may safely go further, and say that the *clergy* hold this balance of power. For, consider their influence a moment. The clergy of the United States number approximately 175,000, and there are, perhaps, about three times as many in Europe, exclusive of Russia—700,000 in all. These men as a class have that authority which flows from a thorough education, they have the prestige of representing a religion that has surpassed all others in its power to uplift humanity, and they have the unique personal influence that springs from a ministry to men in the vital matters of the soul, and in the most sacred events of the outward life. These 700,000 Christian ministers have an opportunity to determine the ideals of perhaps twenty millions of boys and girls whom they have consecrated to the God of peace in baptism.

Moreover, this great host of ministers who are pledged to preach the Gospel would have, in the advocacy of peace, almost the unanimous support of the women of the Church, probably not less than fifty millions, as well as the support

of a majority of those women of Christian lands who are not in the Church, and they would also be upheld by a number of men within the Church which, if not as large as the number of women, would, nevertheless, be many times as large as the army of Xerxes, while a multitude of men outside the Church are ready for a leadership of peace.

Upon these 700,000 ministers of the Gospel rests a peculiarly solemn responsibility for the peace of the world. They are, of all men, best acquainted with the teaching of Jesus, and it is their sole business in life to enforce that teaching. Granted that they do not agree on the question whether the Gospel *ever* sanctions war, they must agree, if they read the Gospel intelligently and without the fear of man, that Jesus laid supreme emphasis on the attainment of qualities of character which render war increasingly impossible, and they must agree that the spirit of Jesus would try every suggestion of brotherly love before it would even consider a resort to the "dread arbitrament of war."

The responsibility of Christian ministers in this matter is beyond question, and their general failure to meet their responsibility in a worthy manner is equally beyond question. When will

they unitedly lift their voice and speak peace to the nations? Presidents and Kings have great power to check, or to promote war, but Christian ministers possess together a power that is far mightier.

The Bible at its highest, which means Jesus and his Gospel, is for peace, because it teaches a religion grounded in the fatherly character of God, and because it teaches brotherhood as the supreme law of human society. The Bible has promoted peace, and will continue to promote peace through single individuals, who have been inspired by the beauty and the strength of its religion, as it has also promoted war, and may yet again promote war, through the influence of individuals who draw from the lowest levels of the Bible; but not until the leaders of the Church stand forth in their might—the might of conscience, the might of united endeavor, the might of their high calling—will the Bible have that master influence in realizing the vision of universal peace which of right belongs to it.

The momentum of the Church ought to be the very center of the momentum of Christian civilization as a whole. To fulfil that mission it is needful that the Church, and first of all the leaders of the Church—the 700,000 Christian

ministers—should recognize that the Bible at its highest challenges the highest in man, and should respond to that challenge with an earnestness worthy of "the great hopes that make us men."

CHAPTER VIII

JESUS AND THE MODERN PEACE MOVEMENT

THE modern Peace Movement is a deep and powerful river, formed by the union of a number of differing streams. Only one of these confluent tributaries has its immediate origin in the Gospel. Others proceed from springs unlike that, and also more or less unlike each other. This fact is the subject of the present discussion. We shall seek to indicate the relation between the peace of Jesus and the modern Peace Movement.

It is not especially suitable to apply to Jesus that title which, centuries before his day, was given by a great Hebrew prophet to that man who, in his fond hope, was to rule long and righteously upon the throne of David—the title Prince of Peace. For Jesus was not a prince, but a peasant, and instead of courting royal power he positively refused to listen to the proposal to make him a king. Moreover, even as a prophet of the Kingdom of God, it was not his aim to establish peace among the nations. He was not

a peace advocate any more than he was a temperance advocate, or an advocate of democracy and universal suffrage. Jesus was a peaceable citizen, who paid his taxes; he did not speak evil of the Roman government, and did not encourage the revolutionary party to take up arms in the interest of national independence; but when he came forth as a public teacher he did not take peace as his theme. He never exhorted his disciples to labor for the abolition of war, or instructed them regarding the means of securing national and international peace.

Jesus was not a prince, and he was not an advocate of peace. To call him the Prince of Peace is to set his work in a wrong perspective, and to give to a historical by-product of the Gospel the honor due to the Gospel itself.

The peace which the old prophet had in view, as he anticipated the coming of a glorious Davidic ruler, was political; it was the quiet and orderly movement of national life; an enduring freedom from enemies within the confines of Israel, and without. But were we to characterize the work of Jesus as a work of *peace,* we should unquestionably have to think of that peace as *religious,* rather than political. It would be descriptive of that new relationship between man

and God—that relationship of trust and joy—which, being realized uniquely in Jesus, it was his aim to have realized in all hearts. It is, therefore, peculiarly unfit to transfer to the Founder of the Christian religion the old title given to an expected occupant of David's throne.

And yet, while all this is true, it is also true that the one deep spring of political peace which has been discovered in the past nineteen centuries is found in the Gospel of Jesus. It is, indeed, only a by-product of his message, but not accidental, nor superficial. On the contrary, it is an inevitable and magnificent by-product. For the peace of the Gospel is the correlate of brotherhood, the outward expression of that kindly feeling for fellow men, which proceeds ultimately from a living faith in the fatherly character of God. It is a spirit rather than a form. It ignores the barriers of race and culture. It is spontaneous and unselfish.

This peace between men, which is the reflex of the brotherhood of man, is not a thing that treaties can either produce or guard. It has no need of courts of arbitration, no need of international police. Where Jesus' ideal of brotherhood is realized, there peace is indestructible.

This peace of brotherhood is, in the thought

of Jesus, a religious state. It is not from beneath, but from above. The sun, whose warmth produces the feeling of brotherliness, and so creates peace, is the Father in heaven. From fatherliness flows brotherliness, and from brotherliness peace. The guaranty of peace is as strong as the bond of faith, and the strength of faith is in proportion to its realization of the fatherly character of God. Any community or group of communities, small or large, in which religion means simply love of God and godly love of man, has peace. The ultimate political state of the world, if the Gospel shall prevail, will be no less religious, fundamentally, than the life of the individual Christian.

Such is the conception of peace implicitly contained in the Gospel. We can not say that it is an unrealizable ideal, for already, to a degree, it has been realized. One need not go farther for illustration than the missionary history of the last century. The missionary has been a brother to the African, the Indian, the Japanese, and the Chinese, and this brotherliness has made for peace as no other single force has done. What is to-day the foundation of the trust which Japan and China have in us? Is it not before all things that brotherly interest which has built

hospitals in those lands, where tens of thousands of sufferers are helped every year, which has ministered to the starving in times of famine, and which has sought to kindle in the soul a new and purer and stronger life?

An ideal unrealized the peace of brotherhood doubtless is, but for a considerable number of people it is not counted as finally unrealizable, indeed, it is thought to be the only peace which will prove permanent and satisfactory.

But we turn from the peace of brotherhood to the modern Peace Movement. We notice at once a different atmosphere. The peace that is being sought is somewhat unlike that which has just been described. Moreover, we see new and powerful motives at work in the Peace Movement. We also see men earnestly engaged in the cause to whom Jesus is a stranger, and others in whose lives religion has no acknowledged place. We find the machinery of governments involved in the movement, as well as many individuals and many societies, both national and international. How does this vast movement stand related to Jesus, and to the peace implicit in his message?

In the first place, this modern Peace Movement is purposed and self-conscious. Peace is definitely sought as a good of almost unlimited

worth. It is separated from other goods and considered by itself. It is aimed at directly, and many of the agencies employed for its attainment have reference to it, and to nothing else. Herein lies a difference between the method of the modern Peace Movement, and that of the Gospel as an agency of peace. Peace is now the immediate end, and not the concomitant of a higher and broader end. The only notable exception to this statement is the religious activity of the Church, both at home and abroad. That activity, true to the Gospel, aims at something more fundamental than political tranquility.

Again, the modern Peace Movement not only makes peace the sole object of its endeavor, but it is a movement, two of whose most conspicuous motives are the economic and the humanitarian. War, it is urged, is wasteful, war is cruel; therefore war ought to be abolished. The waste is material—destruction of property in time of war, mal-appropriation of property in time of peace to prepare for war; the waste is physical—the deterioration of the race through the slaughter of the strong young men; and the waste is moral —the hardening of the heart toward suffering, the development of the wild, fierce qualities of human nature in the camp and battle-field, far

from the influence of women and little children in the home, and the paralysis of the religion of love.

War is cruel and pitiless. The joy of the present and hope of the future disappear in its bloody maw. The wheels of progress are blocked, sometimes for generations. War piles up debts for the children and grandchildren of those who fall on the field. War exalts types of character which are relatively low, qualities especially suited to the work of destruction. Wars produce dictators and despots, clever maneuvrers of armies and bold fighters—Joshuas and Davids, it may be, but oftener a Periander, a Clovis, a Richard III., a John, a Tilly, an Alva—but they do not produce great educators and inventors, great philanthropists and artists, great poets and prophets, or simply plain, good men.

Such, in brief, is the burden of a thousand voices that are raised to-day in behalf of peace. But these arguments that spring out of economic and humanitarian considerations, however moving and conclusive they may be—and surely they are so strong that they are not likely to be ignored henceforth by the advocates of peace—are obviously different from the peace motives which underlie the peace of brotherhood in the Gospel,

and they differentiate the modern movement for universal peace from the movement by which the peace of Jesus is realized. These arguments are by no means anti-Christian, they are simply non-Christian. They are legitimate, they are easily grasped, and they are increasingly potent. But we can hardly imagine Jesus arguing against war, and seeking to move men to a league of everlasting peace, on the ground that war is wasteful of a nation's resources, or on the ground that it checks humane progress. From the high plane of divine fatherhood and human brotherhood on which his thought moved, war, unless imperatively demanded by the supreme obligation of love, which is, perhaps, conceivable, is a black denial of the character of God, and of that in man which is most like God. For the kingdom of heaven is the rule of love, but war has usually been an orgy of selfishness and hate. From the point of view of the Gospel, war is something vastly more evil than an economic blunder or an error of humanitarian statesmanship. The judgment on it, which is implicit in the Gospel, is that it denies the obligation of supreme love to God and equal love to man.

Again, the modern Peace Movement, leaving out now the work of the Church, builds its hope

largely on the establishment of international laws. Its highest concrete embodiment is the Palace of Peace at The Hague. One feature of the international institution at The Hague makes a particularly close approach to the spirit of the Gospel, namely, the Tribunal of Arbitration. This stands ready to adjust any differences between nations which may be brought to it by the parties in dispute. Its mission is to avert war by means of mediation. *Were* there a public sentiment in all lands strong enough to secure the reference to this Tribunal of every international difficulty which could not be amicably settled by the parties involved, and strong enough to secure the acceptance of the judgment of the Tribunal, then, indeed, international wars between any of the signatories to The Hague Convention would be impossible. International peace would be secure. But the necessary public sentiment is lacking. There was no movement for arbitration between Russia and Japan, none on the part of England in its trouble with the Transvaal, none on the part of the Balkan States, either in their common trouble with the Turks or in their subsequent strife among themselves, tho all these enormously destructive wars came between the two Hague Conferences, or

followed closely upon the second. Moreover, there is no reasonable ground of hope that this necessary public sentiment will be created by the mere existence of the high Tribunal at The Hague, or by any legislation whatsoever. True, the necessary public sentiment appears to be slowly forming, but no one can foresee the day when it will have gained the desired strength and stability.

But The Hague is also the most striking embodiment of the movement toward universal peace by means of international laws. The various Conventions agreed upon in 1907 illustrate the strength and the trend of the movement. These concern the method of the recovery of international debts, the opening of hostilities in case of war, the rights and duties of neutrals in case of war on land or on sea, the status of merchant ships belonging to an enemy at the outbreak of a war, and the conversion of such vessels into warships, the laying of automatic submarine mines, naval bombardment in time of war, the right of capture in naval war, and the creation of an international prize court. In addition to these Conventions is that for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

With these agreements reached at The Hague

we may associate, as in part representing the modern peace sentiment, those international treaties which, coming into prominence in the middle of the seventeenth century, have increased in number rapidly since the Jay treaty of 1795. These also are external means designed to avert wars and to maintain peace.

Now the modern Peace Movement, as partially exprest in international treaties and the Conventions reached at The Hague, is obviously unlike that movement which was implicit in the Gospel at the start, and which we may see vaguely and fragmentarily manifest in the historical movement of Christianity. Broadly speaking, it is an attempt to secure peace by external pressure and restraint, while the method implicit in the Gospel is inward and spontaneous.

It is clear from this analysis of the method of peace implied in the Gospel, and that of the modern Peace Movement, that the latter is distinctly broader than the former. It is also doubtless true that its results in one century are more conspicuous than the results of the other method, after a trial of nineteen centuries. Perhaps it may be said that the very success of the modern Peace Movement is evidence that the earlier one was inadequate. Yet this judgment

should be made with caution. For, on the one hand, it is too early to estimate the value of The Hague Conventions, or even of treaties and international law, and on the other hand, it would seem to be more accurate to say that the implicit method of peace in the Gospel is not so much inadequate to the needs of mankind as it is difficult of realization on account of its lofty conception of the nature of peace. When peace is regarded as a social expression of brotherhood, it must, of course, wait on the realization of the ideal. In other words, its progress will be slow. But when this peace comes, it abides, needing no safeguards, fearing no overthrow. It has the beauty and strength of brotherhood.

No lover of peace and of the progress of mankind can fail to be encouraged by the growing success of the modern Peace Movement, where it transcends the indirect and purely religious method of the Gospel. Let this movement be intensified, says every lover of peace, and let its great international agencies have ever-increasing authority to allay the passions of men, and to guard against the excitement of warlike passions. Yet this authority alone, we are constrained to believe, will never suffice to maintain a stable peace.

When the giant of lust for wider realms and greater riches, or the giant of racial antagonism, with a thousand inherited bitternesses in his breast, or, most formidable of all, the giant of religious fanaticism, who, tho he now slumbers, is not dead, arises in a nation and shakes himself, then all the finely wrought bonds of international law, the Resolutions and Recommendations and Conventions laboriously perfected at The Hague and wound around the governments of the world, will be snapt asunder, even as the withes of the Philistines, that bound the mighty limbs of the hero of Zorah. That is the unmistakable and solemn teaching of history. Therefore, while lending all possible help to the modern Peace Movement, and rejoicing in its partial securities, let those who are moving toward peace by the longer and higher road of Jesus faint not in their efforts to purify and exalt the religious life of mankind through the infusion of the spirit of the Gospel, for it is they, assuredly, who must work underneath the peace of outward enactment, the inward and imperishable peace of brotherhood.

GENERAL INDEX

Abishai, 18.
Abraham, father of the Hebrew people, 2; soldiers of, 2.
Agag and Samuel, 13.
Ahab and Jehoshaphat, 21.
Alfred the Great, 125–126, 139.
Amalek, 5–6, 14.
Amalekites, 29.
Amaziah, 23.
American Peace Society, 145.
Ammonites, 17; Jephthah and the, 12.
Amos' vision of peace, 69–70.
Antiquity warlike, 3–4.
Apocalyptic army weaponless, 157.
Appeal to the Bible, defects of, 190.
Aquitania, bishops of, 127.
Arbitration, Tribunal of, 215.
Archbishops of England, 127.
Ark of the Covenant, 36–37.
Armament, Canaanitic, 27; Hebrew, 26-27.
Armies, Hebrew standing, 24-25.
Army, Saul's, 13.
Assyrians and Israel, 20; and Judah, 20.
Athaliah, 23.
Athanasius on war, 111; *Incarnation of the Word*, 112.
Athenagoras, *Plea for Christians*, 95-96.
Augustine of Hippo, *City of God*, 112; on military service, 110-111.
Babylonians and Israel, 20.
Baeda, 118.
Barcochba, 24.
Bartol, C. A., 177-178.
Basil the Great, *Canons*, 110; *Letters*, 109, 114; on military service, 109.
Battle of Richmond in War Songs and Poems of the Confederacy, 158.
Battle, presence of Yahweh in, 36.
Battles, God of, 159.
Beatitudes of Jesus, 57.
Benaiah, 18.
Ben-hadad, 21.
Ben-hadad II., 19.
Benjamin a ravening wolf, 3; tribe of, 12.
Bible and Life, 195–196; and the English-Boer war, 180–189; authority of the, 154ff; Church's use of, 200-202; defects of appeal to, 190; discrimination in use of, 199; in the Civil War, 156–180; misuse of the, 155ff; nature of, 197–198; peace stimulated by, 93; war stimulated by, 92.
Biblical influence on civilization, 91ff.
Bishops and peace, 127.
Blessing of Esau, Isaac's, 3; of Jacob's sons, 3.
Bloch, Jean de, *Future of War*, 141.
Bloodshed, theological disputes and, 113.
Boer war, Bible and the, 180-189; clergy and the, 181-185.
Boniface, 120.
Booty, Yahweh and, 41.
Bow, Song of the, 12, 13.
Brotherhood developing, Christian, 113; peace and, 209.
Bull *Unam Sanctam*, 123.
Burgundy, bishops of, 127.
Bushnell, Horace, 174-175.
Calixtus III., 121.
Canaanites of Arad, 6.
Canaanitic armament, 27.
Canute, King, and peace, 126.
Captives, Deuteronomist and the treatment of, 31; Hebrew treatment of, 32-33.
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 148.
Cassiodorus, 118.
Catherine of Siena, 131, 202.
Chalcedon, *Canons of*, 107, 114; Council of, on military service, 107.

Charlemagne and war, 116-117, 136.
Christian brotherhood developing, 113; legislation on military service, 106-107.
Christians and military service under Constantine, 104-106; second century, and peace, 94-95; second century, and war, 94-97; third century, and war, 97.
Church and peace, 202; duties of, 202-206.
Church's influence for peace, 119-120, 124-128; use of Bible, 200-202.
Civil War, Bible in the, 156-180.
Civilization, Biblical influence on, 91ff.
Cleaveland, E. L., *Patriot's Song of Victory*, 171-174.
Clergy and the Boer war, 181-185, duties of, 203-205.
Constantine, Christians and military service under, 104-106.
Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, 106, 114.
Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, 150.
Covenant, Ark of the, 36-37.
Cromwell, Oliver, 53, 136.
Crosby, H., *God's View of Rebellion*, 176-177.
Crucé, Emeric, 140.
Crusades an agent of war, 129.
Dante, 121.
Darby, *International Tribunals*, 140.
David a freebooter, 16; a man of war, 15; and fighting, 17; and Goliath, 15; wars of, 16-18.
David's practise in war, 29-30.
Deborah, 10; and Barak, war-song of, 171.
Deutero-Isaiah's vision of peace, 71.
Deuteronomist and the treatment of captives, 31.
De Wet, C. R., *The Three Years' War*, 188.
Diognetus, Epistle to, 95.
Divided kingdom, wars of, 19-24.
Douglas, Stephen A., 161.
Ecclesiastical Canons, 114.
Edom, 19.
Education and peace, 124.
Egyptians in Palestine, 20.
Elisha, 40.
Enemies, love of, 57.
England, peace societies in, 145.
English-Boer war, Bible and the, 180-189.
Esau, Isaac's blessing of, 3.
Ethical thought of war, beginnings of, 46-48.
Eusebius, *Church History*, 95, 114; *Life of Constantine*, 103-105.
Ezekiel's picture of peace, 70.
Fagan, *Southern War Songs*, 159.
Fighting, David, and, 17.
Forgiveness, unlimited, 57.
Froneman, General, 188-189.
Gad, 3.
Gangra, Canons of, 114.
Gideon, 11.
Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, 117, 127, 128.
God of battles, 159.
God's peace, 127-128.
Golden Age, Hebrew, 67-90; realized in Jesus, 87-90.
Goliath and David, 15.
Greeley, Horace, 162.
Gregory II., 116, 119.
Gregory Nazianzen, *Oration on Basil*, 113.
Gregory the Great and war, 114-116; *Epistles*, 114-115, 120.
Grotius, Hugo, *Law of War and Peace*, 138-140.
Hague Conferences, 148-151, 215-219.
Hale, Edward Everett, *The Desert and the Promised Land*, 169.
Hazael, 19.
Hebrew golden age, 67-90; armament, 26-27; military organization, 25; people, father of the, 2; standing armies, 24-25; treatment of captives, 32-33; Utopia peaceful, 67; view of war, 35; warfare, horrors of, 28-32; warfare, religious character of, 38-39; warlike ideals, early, 3.
Henry IV., *Grand Design*, 140.
History of European Morals, 129.
Holmes, O. W., *Army Hymn, Parting Hymn*, 157.
Hosea's picture of peace, 70.

Howe, Julia Ward, *Battle Hymn of the Republic*, 159.
Ideal future, the Hebrew, 75-78.
Inaugural address of President Kruger, 186.
Innocent III., 123.
Innocent VIII., 122, 130.
Inspiration, 172ff.
Institutions of peace, 145-151.
International League of Peace, 146.
Interparliamentary Union, 147.
Isaac's blessing of Esau, 3.
Isaiah's vision of peace, 71, 75-76.
Ishmael, 2.
Israel and Assyrians, 20; and Babylonians, 20; and Judah, wars of, 21; and Syrians, 19; civil wars of, 22.
Jabesh-Gilead, inhabitants of, 12.
Jacob's blessing of his sons, 3.
Jael's murder of Sisera, 10.
James IV., 137.
James, Epistle of, on war, 65.
Jehoash, 23.
Jehoshaphat and Ahab, 21.
Jephthah, Ammonites and, 12.
Jericho, 9.
Jerusalem, Fall of, 586 B.C., 23.
Jesus, Beatitudes of, 57; golden age realized in, 87-90; quoted in favor of war, 162; teachings of, 56-62; the prince of peace, 89, 207.
Jesus' words interpreted, 165-167.
Joel and war, 79.
Joseph, bow of, 3.
Joshua, age of Moses and, 4; wars of, 9.
Judah and Israel, wars of, 21; and the Assyrians, 20; civil wars of, 22-23; the lion's whelp, 3.
Judas Maccabæus, 26.
Judges, warlike period of the, 10, 12.
Judgment in military language, divine, 44-46.
Justice of Yahweh, 6.
Justin Martyr, *Address*, 95; *First Apology*, 95.
Kant, Immanuel, *Essay on Perpetual Peace*, 140.
Kipling, Rudyard, *The Old Issue*, 181.
Kruger, President, 185-187.
Lactantius, *Divine Institutes*, 106; *Of the Manner in which Persecutors Died*, 103.
Lecky, *History of European Morals*, 129.
Leo X., 130.
Levi, Swords of Simeon and, 3.
Life and the Bible, 195-196.
Lincoln, Abraham, 170-171, 180.
Lincoln, Bishop of, 182-183.
Lollard Conclusion of 1394, 132-133.
Love is the supreme law, 60; of enemies, 57.
Maccabees, 23.
Martin of Tours, on military service, 108.
Maurus, Rabanus, 118.
Mead, E. D., 141.
Meade, Bishop, 168.
Melchizedek of Salem, 2.
Mercy of Yahweh, 6.
Middle Ages, war in the, 116-121.
Midianites, 8.
Military language, divine judgment in, 44-46; organization, Hebrew, 25; service, Augustine of Hippo on, 110-111; service, Basil the Great on, 109; service, early Christian legislation on, 106-107; service, Martin Tours on, 108; service, Theodoret of Cyrus on, 108-109; service under Constantine, Christians and, 104-106.
Missionary examples, 210.
Moab, 17, 19.
Modern period, war in the, 135-137.
Moltke and war, 151.
Monasticism and war, 117-119.
Morality of war not questioned in Old Testament, 42.
More, Sir Thomas, 134-135; *Utopia* and peace, 134.
Moses, 4-5; and Joshua, age of, 4; four wars of, 6; wars of, 5.
Mullen, W. J., 162ff.
Napoleon, wars of, 137.
Nebuchadnezzar as Yahweh's servant, 47.
New Testament, spirit of the, 53-57.
Nicholas II., Czar, 140.
Nicholas V., 130.

Non-resistance, doctrine of, 57-61.
Og, 6.
Old Testament, warlike Yahweh in the, 1.
Origen, *Against Celsus*, 101ff; on war, 101-103.
Original Sources of European History, 125.
Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, Convention for the, 151.
Palace of Peace, 215.
Palestine, Egyptians in, 20.
Papacy and peace, 129-130; and war, 121-123.
Pastor, *History of the Popes*, 121, 130.
Patriarchal age, stories of the, 2.
Paul and war, 63-65.
Paul II., 122, 130.
Paul, Herbert, 185.
Peace advocates, early, 131-132; Amos' vision of, 69-70; and brotherhood, 209; and education, 124; and the papacy, 129-130; bishops and, 127; Canute and, 126; Carnegie Endowment for International, 148; Church and, 202; Church's influence for, 119-120, 124-128; Congress, Universal, 146-147; Deutero-Isaiah's vision of, 71; Endowment, World, 147; Ezekiel's picture of, 70; first appeal for, 132; fruits of, 72-75; God's, 127-128; Hosea's picture of, 70; in the second century, influence of the Gospel for, 94; Institutions of, 145-151; Isaiah's vision of, 71, 75-76; Jesus the prince of, 89, 207; More's *Utopia* and, 134; movement, modern, 207, 211ff; of brotherhood an unrealized ideal, 211; of Hebrew Utopia, 67; Palace, 215; prophetic visions of, 69-80; second century Christians and, 94-97; societies, 145, 146; societies in England, 145; societies in United States, 145; spirit of, in New Testament, 54-57; stimulated by Bible, 93; to be universal, 74-78; Yahweh as God of, 81.
Peaceful, Hebrew Utopia, 67.
Peace-vision, persistence of, 85-87.
Penn, William, *Essay on the Peace of Europe*, 142.
Philistines, 13, 14, 17.
Pillage, war and, 8.
Pius II, 122.
Plumpton, Vicar, 184.
Poetry and war, Hebrew, 48-53.
Prophetic visions of peace, 69-80.
Prophets and war, 40.
Prophets of war, 21.
Rey, General de la, 188.
Samuel and Agag, 13.
Samuel's orders in war, 29.
Saul's army, 13; wars, 13, 14.
Savonarola, 121.
Scott, J. B., *Texts of the Peace Conferences at The Hague*, 138, 151, 152.
Scripture, Misuse of, 155ff.
Second-century Christians and war, 94-97.
Shammah, 18.
Sihon, 6.
Simeon and Levi, swords of, 3.
Sisera, Jael's murder of, 10.
Sixtus IV., 130.
Solomon's peaceful reign, 18.
Song of the Bow, 12, 13.
Songs for Soldiers, 158.
Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, 104, 113.
Sulpitius Severus, *Life of St. Martin of Tours*, 108.
Stead, W. T., 181-182.
Storm-god of Sinai, Yahweh the, 4.
Stowe, Harriet Beecher, *Holy War*, 156.
Suttner, Baroness Bertha von, *Lay Down Your Arms*, 141.
Swinburne, A. C., *The Transvaal*, 181.
Swords of Simeon and Levi, 3.
Sylvester II., 121.
Syrians, 17, 21; and Israel, 19.
Taylor, Bayard, 159.
Tennyson and war, 142; *Locksley Hall*, 142.
Tertullian's protest against war, 97-101.
Theodoret of Cyrus on military service, 108-109; *Ecclesiastical History*, 113-114; *Letters*, 108.

Theological disputes and bloodshed, 113.
Theophilus, 95-96.
Thompson, J. P., *Advancement of Christ's Kingdom by War*, 178-180.
Tolstoy, Leo, 143-144.
Tribunal of Arbitration, 215.
Union, Interparliamentary, 147.
United States, peace societies in, 145.
Universal peace congresses, 146-147.
Urban II., 121.
Urban VI., 122.
Utopia and peace, More's, 134.
Utopia, Hebrew, 75-78; peaceful, 67.
Viljoen, Ben, 186.
Visions, Unrealized, 81-85.
War, 212-213; and Charlemagne, 116-117, 136; and Joel, 79; and monasticism, 117-119; and papacy, 121-123; and pillage, 8; and prophets, 40; and Yahweh, 46, 49-53; and Zechariah, 80; Athanasius on, 111; beginnings of ethical thought of, 46-48; crusades an agent of, 129; David a man of, 15; David's practises in, 29-30; Epistle of James on, 65; first appeal for the abolition of, 132; Gregory the Great and, 114-116; Hebrew poetry and, 48-53; Hebrew view of, 35; in the Middle Ages, 116-121; in the modern period, 135-137; Jesus quoted in favor of, 162; Moltke and, 151; not questioned in Old Testament, Morality of, 42; Origen on, 101-103; Paul and, 63-65; persistence of visions of, 78-80; prophets of, 21; Samuel's orders in, 29; second century Christians and, 94-97; stimulated by the Bible, 92; Tennyson and, 142; Tertullian's protest against, 97-101; third century Christians and, 97; Yahweh, a man of, 4; Yahweh a teacher of, 51; Yahweh's relation to, 36-42.
Warfare, horrors of Hebrew, 28-32; religious character of Hebrew, 38-39.
Warlike, antiquity, 3-4; ideals, early Hebrew, 3; language on moderns, effect of, 53; period of the Judges, 10, 12; Yahweh in the Old Testament, 1.
Wars, Moses' four, 6; of David, 16-18; of Israel, 19-24; of Israel, Civil, 22; of Joshua, 9; of Judah, Civil, 22-23; of Moses, 5; of Saul, 13, 14; of Yahweh, book of the, 1.
War-song of Deborah and Barak, 171.
White, A. D., *Autobiography*, 138.
Wilson, Holt, 167.
Worcester, Noah, *Solemn Review of the Custom of War*, 143.
World Peace Endowment, 147.
Wyclif, John, 132-133; as peace advocate, 131-132.
Yahweh, a man of war, 4; a teacher of war, 51; and booty, 41; and war, 46, 49-53; as a God of peace, 81; as leader, 37; as universal, 42-43; book of the wars of, 1; in battle, presence of, 36; in the Old Testament, warlike, 1; the storm-god of Sinai, 4.
Yahweh's relations to war, 36-42.
Zechariah and war, 80.
Zobah, 17.

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

Genesis: PAGE
3:15 159
12:7 7
13:12, 14-17 7
14:14 2
16:12 2
17:8 7
27:40 3
49, 5, 8, 27 3

Exodus:
2:11-13 5
14:24-25 36
15:3 4
17:8-15 5

Numbers:
10:11 36
10:33 35
13-14 169
14:9 35
21:1-3 ..... 6, 36, 41
21:14 1
21:33 7
23:21 35
24:8 28
25:3-5 7
25:4 41
25:17-18 8
31:16 7
31:28, 30 8

Deuteronomy:
1:30 35
2:7 35
3:22 35
20:4 37
25:17-19 6

Joshua:
3:3 37
8:2 25
12:24 9
17:16 27

Judges: PAGE
2:24-27 10
3:2 51
4:3 27
5 173
5:8 14
6:4 11
6:21 11
6:24 39
7:8, 22 11
7:18, 20 38
8:10-12 11
8:27 ..... 39, 41
11:30-41 41
20 12
20:18 38
20:23 38
20:27-28 38
21:8-12 12

I Samuel:
4:3, 11 37
7:9 39
7:10 36
8:12 25
11:8 14
13:2 ..... 13, 24
13:5 ..... 14, 27
14:52 13
15:4 14
15:33 13
18:5 15
22:7 25
23:2 39
25:28 35
27:1-4 16
27:9 30
27:10 16
29:2 ..... 16, 25
30:2 30
30:7 39

2 Samuel: PAGE
1:22 13
1:27 12
2:8 25
3-5 16
5:13 17
5:17-25 17
5:19, 23 39
5:24 37
8:1 17
8:2 30
8:2-3 17
8:4 27
8:5-6 17
8:6, 14 25
8:12 41
8:16 25
10-11 17
10:18 27
11:11 37
12:26-31 17
12:31 30
15-19:10 17
17 15
17:8 15
18:4 25
21:15-22 17
22 51
22:36 26

1 Kings:
2:5, 9 30
4:4 25
10:26 .....24, 27
12:21-24 .....21, 168
12:22 40
14:3 21
14:25-28 20
15:3, 13 29
15:11 21
15:18 21
15:27-29 22
16:8-12 22
16:18 22
20:13-15, 28, 42 40
20:31 28
20:42 30
22:1 19
22:2 21
22:5 40

2 Kings:
3:6 19
3:11 40

2 Kings PAGE
3:19 30
3:27 41
6:8-24 31
6:24 19
8:12 29
8:20 19
8:25 19
8:25-29 21
9:5 25
9:24, 33 22
10:7 22
10:32 19
11:10 27
11:15 23
12:20 23
13:3, 24, 25 19
14:7 19
14:19 23
15:3 22
15:10 22
15:14 22
15:19, 29 20
15:25 22
15:31 19
15:37 21
16:5 .....19, 21
16:9 25
16:15 41
17:3 20
18-19 41
19:19 43
19:35-36 84
23: 29, 33-34 20
24:2 19

1 Chronicles:
22:8 15
28:3 15

Psalms:
7:12 49
9:6 50
9:9 49
18:2 49
21:12 49
24:8 50
27:3 53
28:7 49
35:2 49
35:3 50
44:2 36
45 52
60:10 43

Psalms: PAGE
68:7 36
68:17 50
72 77
72:11, 17 77
78:9 52
78:65-66 50
83:6-11 50
89:43 43
91:7 53
107:16 50
108:11 43
110:5 50
111:6 50
135:10 50
138:19-20 36
144 51
149 52
149:6 52

Isaiah:
2:2 82
2:3 75
2:4 75
4:5 71
9:5 75
9:12 44
11:9 74
11:13 74
11:14 78
11:22-23 73
13:5, 17-18 44
15:9 45
16:8-9 45
19:1-4 45
19:18-25 76
21:15 45
25 76
25:8 72
29:17 69
30 84
30:25 69
30:26 71
32:15 69
33:24 72
34:6 45
35:10 74
41:45 82
44:28 73
49:23 77
51:3 69
51:11 74
54:13 ..... 73, 74

Isaiah: PAGE
60 82
60: 11-12 77
60:13 71
60:19 71
60:22 72
61:13 73
62:3, 4 71
62:5 ..... 73, 74
65:19 74
65:20 72
65:22 72
66:12 72

Jeremiah:
3:16 37
9:16 45
20:4 47
23:6 74
25:11 47
25:15 45
29:10 82
30:19 72
31:12 ..... 69, 74
31:34 74
31:38-40 71
33:9 71
33:16 74
33:18, 22 73
43:10 47
47:6 47
50:17-18 47

Ezekiel:
5:17 177
25:1-7, 8-11 46
27:29 46
29:13-21 82
34:13-16 69
35:25 70
36:10-11 72
36:25 69
37:16-22 74
37:26 72
38:11 75

Daniel:
7:27 78

Hosea:
1:4 47
2:16 74
2:18 ..... 70, 82
2:18-20 70
14:5-6 72

Joel: PAGE
3:1-13 79

Amos:
1 44
1:11 46
2:9 36
9:7 42
9:9 73
9:13 69

Micah:
5:6 44
5:10-11 75
6:14-16 44

Haggai:
2:21-22 46
2:23 83

Zechariah:
4:9 83
6:12 83
9:10 75
9:13 46
10:10 72
14 85
14:3 35
14:6 80
14:8 72
14:9, 11 80
14:17, 19 80
14, 21 80

Matthew:
5:7, 9 57
5:22 57
5:29 57
5:44 57
6:15 57
10:24, 28 165
10:35 163
24:6 .....57, 181
26:52 .....57, 100, 123

Mark: PAGE
10:34 61
10:45 57
13:7 62
13:11 59
14:47 62
14:48-49 58

Luke:
10:23-24 86
11:31 86
12:51 61
17:21 86
21:9 62
22:15 62
22:38 59

Romans:
12:18-21 63
13:2 176
14:17 63
16:20 63

1 Corinthians:
6:1-7 100

Galatians:
5:19-20 63

Ephesians:
4:1-3, 32 64
6:11-18 64

2 Timothy:
2:3 64

Hebrews:
9:22 178
11:32-39 .....65, 173

James:
3:17 65

1 Peter:
2:13 64

Revelation:
6:4 65
12:7-12 178
19:11-16 .....65, 157